THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 1 MARCH VOL. XLIII

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

MODERN CHURCHMEN'S UNION AND CANONICAL MARRIAGE

At their meeting in London on January 23, 1953, the Council of the Modern Churchmen's Union authorized the publication of the following statement of its principles and policy in reference to Marriage and the revision of the Canons.

'(1) *The Sanctity of Marriage*

We believe in the sanctity of the marriage bond and that the Christian ideal is a permanent and life-long union. We believe that a marriage should only be dissolved for a serious matrimonial offence.

(2) *The Present Legal Position of the Clergy and Laity*

The present legal position is set forth by the Legal Board of the Church Assembly in the Official Year Book of the Church of England (Edition 1953, p. 449) as follows:

"Speaking generally, a person above the age of sixteen has the right to be married in his parish church . . ."

"In the case of a person who has been divorced . . . the Incumbent may refuse to officiate . . ."

It is clear that an Incumbent has the legal right to marry divorced persons at his discretion. The proposed Canon 38 will deprive him of this discretionary right.

The right of every person over sixteen to be married in his parish church will be taken away by the proposed Canons in the following cases:

(*a*) If the person's previous marriage has been dissolved and his former partner is still living; at present he can be

married in church if the Incumbent is willing to conduct the ceremony.

(*b*) If the persons (or either of them) are unbaptized (Canon 37).

We are not here considering whether the proposed changes are desirable or not. We are only concerned to maintain that such alterations in the existing law should not be passed without the authority of Parliament.

We are opposed to any attempt to claim that the proposed Canons, or any of them, are not in conflict with the civil law, and therefore may be passed and become Ecclesiastical Law by the ratification of Convocation and the Royal Assent, without Parliamentary consent.

That this is a question of supreme importance is shown by the terms of proposed Canon 9, which has not yet been before Convocation. By this Canon a clergyman who is guilty of "any infraction of, or neglect to observe, such Canon Law" will be liable to very heavy penalties, including degradation and deprivation; a layman would be liable to removal from any Church office he held and to excommunication. This Canon also lays down that such a clergyman or layman should be tried in an Ecclesiastical Court only. This deprives the accused of any right of appeal to the Queen's Courts for justice for alleged offences against *any* of the Canons. We maintain that all the Canons will therefore require the approval of Parliament before they can pass into law.

(3) *Ambiguity*

We hold that the new Canons should be free from ambiguity. This is not the case, especially with regard to Canon 36. Such ambiguity is misleading and indefensible in a legal document.

We hope that these points will receive due consideration when the proposed Canons come before the House of Laity.'

The Episcopal Barrier to Intercommunion

According to the optimistic report of Bishop Stephen Neill in *Towards Church Union*, 1937-1952,[1] the advance of the Christian denominations towards Reunion is going well. The denominations are realizing, not simply that each one of them is within the Christian Church, but that all the other denominations are also inside the Christian Church and that therefore our Christian schisms do not separate us from the Christian Church but only

from each other within that Church. This is most gratifying. It was, if we mistake not, emphasized at the Lambeth Conference of 1920. The problem since then has been how to put this conviction into practice. We Liberals are convinced that it can only be effected by the Lambeth Conference authorizing and encouraging inter-communion. (See *Lambeth and Reunion: A more excellent Way;* published in 1949, Blackwell, price 6d.) But there is a hard fact which stands in the way of our Christian idealism becoming Christian realism. It is Episcopacy.

Let it be realized at the outset that as loyal members of the Church of England we Liberals believe in the historic Episcopate. Trained for ordination in days when Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity* was a text-book for ordinands, we learnt that although Episcopacy is not of the *esse* of the Church, yet it is of its *bene esse*. Consequently, at the Reformation, the Church of England retained Episcopacy for itself as its method of Church government. But this decision demands an explicit answer to the question: Ought the Church of England on that account to refuse Intercommunion with communicant members of Christian Churches which do not possess Episcopacy?

As Anglicans we answer: 'Certainly not, since it is our conviction that Episcopacy is not of the *esse* of the Church and therefore each Christian Church has the right to order its own organization episcopally or non-episcopally, as seems best for it in its special circumstances.' But here is the crux of the situation.

Our Anglican authorities hope that when the non-episcopal denominations realize that intercommunion cannot be granted to them by the Church of England unless and until they accept episcopal government, they will be driven to submit to it.

The *Church Times*, January 30th, under the heading 'The Church must wait for Reunion' cites the Bishop of Durham, Dr. A. M. Ramsey, as announcing that

> 'Until Nonconformity realized the true meaning of episcopacy and felt a hunger for it, the granting of episcopacy held dangers.'

This means that until Nonconformity accepts the Anglo-Catholic doctrine of Episcopacy and submits to it Anglican intercommunion with Nonconformists must be prohibited.

Christian Unity is needful for the Christianization of mankind. If Reunion demands an unchristian totalitarianism, the price is too high for a Christian Church whose essentials are the supremacy of Christian Love, Christian Freedom and Christian Truth.

[1] *Towards Church Union*, 1937—1952.

Dare we assert in the light of the teaching of Jesus Christ St. Paul and St. John that *institutional uniformity* is of the essence of the Christian Religion?

The House of Laity on Intercommunion

The Spring Session of the Church Assembly dealt with issues of vital importance for the future of the Church of England.

In a preliminary meeting of the House of Laity held on February 9th, a motion by Mr. F. J. Powell (Southwark) for the advancement of intercommunion was considered. The terms of Mr. Powell's motion ran as follows:

> 'That the convocations be requested to consider so amending draft Canon 21 as to provide that any person who is a recognised communicant in any Christian denomination shall be admitted to the Holy Communion.'

Draft Canon 21 runs as follows:

> 'No person shall be admitted to the Holy Communion until such time as he shall be confirmed or be ready and desirous to be confirmed except under permission of the bishop of the diocese and subject to any regulations of the convocation of the province relating thereto.'

Mr. J. R. C. Carter (Rochester) in supporting Mr. Powell's motion maintained that the Canon should be brought into line with the world situation and its overwhelming need to secure Christian Unity.

Colonel R. J. Holland (Salisbury) said:

> 'That many prisoners of war had attended communion services held for four or five different Christian denominations, and there was a feeling that they were all worshipping together as Christians.'

Mr. Goyder (Oxford) moved:

> 'That the convocations be requested to consider so amending draft Canon 21 as to provide for the encouragement of hospitality and intercommunion among Christians.' He thought they wanted to express in the canons the spirit which should animate the Church, and as it stood this canon was negative and exclusive.
>
> The motion was defeated by 84 votes to 68 (*Times*, February 10).

We do not regard this rejection as really representing the feeling of the majority of the English laity. What it really represents is the unrepresentative character of the House of Laity.

The Rights of the Laity in Synodical Government

In the second day of the Spring Session of the Church Assembly, presided over by the Archbishop of Canterbury, a very significant resolution was passed by a large majority with the

pprobation of the two Archbishops. This resolution in its final orm ran as follows:

> 'That the assembly respectfully requests the Archbishops to appoint a commission including representatives of the Convocations to consider how the clergy and laity can best be joined together in the synodical government of the Church, and to report.'

Mr. Goyder (Oxford) said in supporting the resolution that he vas conscious that it was of the nature of an innovation, but he rgued, and rightly, that

> 'They wished to preserve the tradition of Convocation, but the existence of a tradition was not a reason for resisting change, and the course he proposed was in accord with the developing needs of the Church and tradition. The revision of canon law was being effected to re-establish order and secure more freedom for the Church, and it would be unrealistic of the Convocation to formulate the new canons on the basis of a greater freedom for the Church without taking into account the necessity for a corresponding adjustment of the position of the laity. If the laity were to exercise an increased responsibility with intelligence they should participate in the discussion of matters that were the concern of the Church as a whole.
>
> There was also the wider question of unity. The Church needed to be strong for the struggle for Christian civilization and it must discover a new unity' (*Times*, December, 1953).

The Two Freedoms

The appointment of an Archbishops' Commission to consider he part to be played by the laity in the government of the Church of England which the *Church Times* (February 13th) speaks of s 'a revolutionary proposal,' though it could be more justly described as 'evolutionary,' since a preliminary and authoritative historical investigation of the part played by the laity in the Church of England was undertaken in 1902 by a joint committee of Convocation which included in its members Bishop Creighton and Canon Overton.

This report[1] has been reprinted with a valuable up-to-date ntroduction (A.D. 1900—1950) by Dr. Norman Sykes, Dixie Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Cambridge. The solution of this problem is of vital importance to our Church to-day as it involves the harmonizing in co-operation of two freedoms which are at present in conflict. These are freedom *for* the Church and freedom *in* the Church. Those who are most insistent in their demand for freedom *for* the Church—by which they mean the abolition of Parliamentary control over the Church: the appointment of bishops by the Prime Minister

[1] Church Information Board, Church House, Westminster (1952; 3/6).

in the name of the Sovereign; the right of appeal from the decisions of the Court of Arches to the Privy Council in Causes Ecclesiastical—are opposed to freedom *in* the Church since those things which they want to get rid of have proved themselves to be, at the bar of historical experience, the bulwarks of freedom *in* the Church of England. These Anglo-Catholics are, unconsciously perhaps, adherents of the Papal policy in Latin Christendom in which the laity have no freedom, except to obey, and all power is concentrated in the hands of ecclesiastics.

The examples which Professor Sykes adduces of 'Freedom for the Church' in our Anglican Churches overseas do not emphasize two very important points.

(1) If these Churches are to hold property, and they all of them need to hold property, then they have to secure legal incorporation from the State — a form of State establishment which restricts freedom *in* the Church.

(2) Secondly, in these overseas Churches the endowments are very small and the clerical orders have to depend upon the voluntary donations of the laity. Hence in cases where the clergy and laity are out of sympathy with each other, a policy of 'starving out' is practised.

In the Church of England with its large endowments for the maintenance of the clergy this power of discipline of the clergy by the laity is practically non-existent.

Experience of Church life in our overseas Churches demonstrates that freedom *for* the Church does not secure freedom *in* the Church. Perhaps here in England we already possess as much freedom *for* the Church as we need, but to preserve freedom *in* the Church the laity must be given more power. It is the realization of this amongst English laymen which is creating growing opposition to the Anglo-Catholic revision of our Canons.

Synodical government even with a legal right of veto vested in the House of Laymen may be used to reduce freedom within the Church unless we can secure a really representative House of Laity.

Post-Critical Scholarship?

The Rev. L. B. Cross, Chairman of the Anglican Evangelical Group Movement, in a letter to his fellow-members intended as an introduction to their Conference, *Toward Reconstruction*, to be held April 27th—30th, at Willersley Castle, Derbyshire, summarizes in a searching and incisive manner the perils which

hreaten the Anglican Church at home and abroad at the present ime. He writes :

'Those who founded our Movement, together with others whose minds had been enlightened by the findings of Biblical scholarship, rebelled against the fundamentalism of their Evangelical forbears, and against the innovations in doctrine and usage of High Anglicanism. They fought for liberty, for freedom in thought and freedom in expression, within the bounds of sound scholarship and the Anglican tradition. The fruits of their labours are to be found in the *Report of the Doctrinal Commission* appointed by the Archbishops in 1922. This has long been forgotten: in some quarters deliberately so, but it still stands as a monument to Christian freedom and liberty of conscience. Much of the ground they gained has been lost; ours is the task of recovering it.

At no time in the history of our Movement, at no time in the history of the Church of England has this freedom, this liberty been in greater danger than now. At no time since the Reformation has the Church so much needed the genius, which, I believe, is inherent in A.E.G.M. and in other liberal movements within the Church, a genius expressive of nothing less than the character of the English people themselves. Can we speak of freedom when that great adventure of the Spirit in South India is being systematically hampered at home? Can we speak of freedom when Reunion with the Free Churches in this country is being hamstrung by ecclesiastical prejudice and arrogance? Can we speak of freedom when the Canons of our Church are being so manipulated by a determined minority within the Church as a whole as to fetter both priest and people under the bondage of law? All these and more are problems of ecclesiastical policy: we must tackle them with vigour and in no uncertain voice.'

These dangers to the victory of the spirit of love and freedom vithin our comprehensive Anglican Communion are only too evident, not only to Liberals within the Church, but to the non-Anglican world which surveys and comments on our Church's imitations and inconsistencies. There is, however, a more subtle danger not realized by the rank and file of Anglican churchmen, clerical and lay, but which threatens to be even more serious in ts ultimate consequences. This danger is recognized acutely by Biblical scholars in the theological faculties of our English niversities.

Mr. Cross, Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford, from 1927, and Vice-Principal of Ripon Hall from 1933, Examiner in the Hon. School of Theology, Oxford, 1937-1939, and Examining Chaplain to a number of our Diocesan Bishops, deals thus with his danger in his prefatory letter to his fellow Liberals :

The foundations of sound scholarship on which we thought Biblical interpretation had been firmly established are slowly but surely being taken away. Those who wish to tie down the thought and the practice of our Church with the shackles of mediaeval theology, and with its dogmas, have discovered an antidote to the conclusion which by intellectual integrity and spiritual insight the founders of our Movement and others reached. That antidote they call *Post-Critical Scholarship*, a contradiction

in terms, for when scholarship ceases to be critical, it ceases to be scholarship. They would have us return to the days of verbal inspiration.

We doubt whether a return to a belief in infallible, plenary, verbal, inspiration of the Bible is really possible for the most uneducated people to-day of the younger generation. A much more likely alternative is the abandonment of Bible study altogether and the substitution of television for it.

We look to the A.E.G.M. in their coming Conference to provide the Church with a statement of the great essential simplicities of Bible Truth and how best to present them convincingly to the Nation to-day.

ARE THE LIBERAL CLERGY HONEST?

An article entitled 'Modern Chuchmen or Unitarians' re-published in the Jubilee number of the *Hibbert Journal* (July, 1952) has evoked a *Rejoinder* in the *Hibbert Journal* (January, 1953) by the Rev. H. Crabtree, Vice-President of the General Assembly of the Unitarian and Free Churches.

We recall that it was with a crabtree cudgel that Christian and Faithful were belaboured by Giant Despair in the dungeon of Doubting Castle. But the Vice-President's manner of cudgelling Anglican Liberal clergymen differs indeed from that of Giant Despair. Charles Lamb records gratefully of his headmaster that he 'handled his rod like a lily.' This is the manner of Mr. Crabtree. He combines courtesy and compliment with chastisement.

The crucial issue in Mr. Crabtree's *Rejoinder* is his query: How is it possible for modernist clergymen as honourable men to retain their positions of dignity and affluence in the Church of England? He writes:

> 'I am not aware that there is any strong inclination among Unitarians to suggest that Anglican modernists ought to withdraw from their Mother Church, but there is certainly a constant sense of wonder felt amongst them that the extremely radical views held by many modernist clergy can apparently be happily and satisfactorily reconciled with their ordination vows and the liturgical practices demanded by the Anglican Church' (p. 170).

It is this vulnerable side of Anglican Modernism attacked by Mr. Crabtree which we defended in an article entitled 'Criticism and Conscience' in the *Hibbert Journal* (April, 1948). As Mr. Crabtree makes no reference in his *Rejoinder* to this article in the *Hibbert Journal* we venture to refer him to it. The article was primarily a defence of the right of Bishop Barnes of Birmingham to publish his book, *The Rise of Christianity*, and yet as an honourable man to retain his bishopric.

The real issue for our modernist clergy is this: Is the Church of England essentially Modernist? Edmund Burke declared that the Church of England, alone among the great historic Christian churches, professed itself fallible. Its repeated revisions of the Book of Common Prayer support this contention, but it is particularly in our Church's history during the last hundred years that its modernist character is demonstrated. The famous Privy Council judgements beginning in 1850 with the Gorham judgement, the Denison Judgement in 1855, *Essays and Reviews* judgement in 1860 granting doctrinal freedom to Low, High and Broad churchmen, followed by the Amended Subscription Act of 1865, rendered the Church of England doctrinally the most Liberal Church in Christendom.

The weighty decision as to the moral right of Liberal clergymen to retain their positions in the Church's ministry although dissenting from it on certain doctrinal and liturgical issues is well presented by Bernard Bosanquet, Editor of the *International Journal of Ethics*, in 1898, in the following statement:

> 'I do not believe that the problem of remaining or not remaining a minister of a certain church ought to be represented primarily by the question of believing or not believing in some of the documents in which it (the Church) requires belief to be professed. I do not think that this is the primary question even for the most critically minded.
>
> (That question is) whether reading together the various formularies and accepted expressions of the Church's doctrine, and considering its history and present work and aims, its cause seems one desirable to promote, and one in promoting which the individual could find his best life work. In reviewing this question, anyone would give weight to such a fact as that formularies, to him obsolete, have to be recited by him in the ritual with an expression of belief. But to anyone who has been able to decide the main question in the affirmative, the question of veracity would be so greatly modified as to present little difficulty.'

The moral jar which is created by modernist clergymen being compelled liturgically to recite formally creeds which they cannot accept in their strict literal sense is due to *liturgical freedom in the Church of England not having advanced at an equal pace with the Church's doctrinal freedom.* For this failure to secure liturgical reform and freedom, it is not the modernist clergy who are to blame but their anti-modernist opponents who have even dared to threaten a schismatic separation from our Church should the liturgical freedom, which the modernists demand, be granted. Yet we have no doubt that modernism will prevail. The way in which the old Anglican Catholicism of Pusey and Liddon was modernized by Gore and the *Lux Mundi school:* the way in which Fundamentalist English Evangelicalism has been modernized by

Archdeacon Vernon Storr: the failure of successive attempts to secure the legal condemnation of leading modernists as heretics: witness to the strength of modernist toleration and modernist comprehensiveness within the Church of England and to the final victory of the Modernist movement — *Eppur si muove.*

The Future of Modernism

Our contemporary *The Modern Free Churchman*[1] (No. 53) publishes a timely article, 'The Future of Modernism,' by L. A. Garrard, M.A., B.D., Editor of the *Hibbert Journal*. Discussing whether Modernism is a 'body of dogmas' or 'an attitude of mind,' Mr. Garrard replies:

> 'I am quite sure, that if we are going to use names like orthodox or reactionary as terms of abuse, we must be careful to restrict them to an attitude of mind' (p. 9).

As Modern Churchmen we are against using 'orthodox' in a depreciatory sense. All the leading English Modernists, *e.g.* Dean Rashdall and Professor Bethune-Baker in the past and Dean Inge, Dean Matthews and Dr. Raven in the present would confute the charge of unorthodoxy. The antithesis of Modernist is not Orthodox but Traditionalist. It was a great orthodox Father of the Church who wrote:—

> 'Christ called Himself the Truth: He did not call Himself Tradition.'

Although the Modernist claims to be orthodox his attitude towards Orthodoxy differs from that of the Traditionalist. The Traditionalist adheres to the Church's orthodox dogmas as infallible and unchangeable. The Modernist accepts the Church's dogmas as working hypotheses — neither infallible nor unchangeable — but as ever open to criticism and revision in the light of profounder experience and deeper and wider knowledge under the guidance of the Spirit of Truth. But the Modernist is in agreement with the Traditionalist in his conviction that spiritual and moral truth demands for its apprehension: faith in the existence of spiritual reality and the need for seeking contact with it on his knees: obedience to the demands of the moral consciousness: and last but not least loyalty to intellectual discipline.

Mr. Garrard challenges the facile assumption that those who are on the side of truth must prevail against their opponents. Truth will prevail but the truth seekers, the truth fighters, so Church history teaches, have again and again been suppressed by

[1] Blackheath Press Ltd., London, S.E.3. Price 6d.

bscurantist tyranny. J. S. Mill wrote in his magnificent Essay h Liberty :

> ' The *dictum* that truth always triumphs over persecution is one of those pleasant falsehoods which men repeat after one another till they pass into commonplaces, but which all experience refutes.'

In dealing with the familiar jibe that ' Modernism is dead ' Ir. Garrard asserts that there is only one convincing answer :

> ' It is for us to show it is not dead.'

ove of truth and reverence for reason are not enough if Christian lodernism is to prevail. It needs vitality and love of souls.)r. Coulton in his *Five Centuries of Religion* points out that in ie conflict between Abelard and Bernard of Clairvaux :

> ' Bernard was bound to win, . . . because the man with a passion for truth cannot stand up to the man with a passion for souls.'

ut Mr. Garrard adds significantly :

> ' And yet in the long run it was not the religion of Bernard that was to prevail. The leaders of the next generation were the men who had been Abelard's pupils ' (p. 10).

n the contest between the Modernist and the Traditionalist it is ot only the soul of the individual but the soul of human civiliza- on that has got to be saved.

Broad views, long views and deep views of what constitutes uman salvation are demanded.

The Practical Problem of the Creeds

' *Can the Christian Creeds be defended* '? a B.B.C. talk by . H. Thouless, published in the *Listener* of January 22, 1953, as produced an important and varied correspondence in succes- ve numbers of the *Listener* which deserves the serious considera- on of our Church authorities. It is convincing evidence that the roblem of the creeds demands liturgical settlement. In his con- uding paragraph Mr. Thouless thus presents the problem of the reeds as he sees it :

> ' It has been my object here to ask questions about the creeds, not to answer them. These are questions which are being asked, and it is important that church members should consider them. Certainly no desire for novelty in teaching should lead us to cast unjustified doubt on the decisions made in the early centuries of Christian teaching. On the other hand, if the Christian bodies to which we belong are using the ancient creeds in a way that shackles improperly the freedom of Christian thought, or that places unnecessary obstacles in the way of those who feel drawn to join a church, then we are much to blame. No reverence for the wisdom of the past can justify us in persisting in such a course. Both points of view are being expressed at the present day. It is for us to consider, under God's guidance, which is right.'

This problem has faced Modern Churchmen for the last hal century. Their first step towards liberation was to secure fron the bishops freedom for a *very wide interpretation* of the creed which permitted everything short of positive denial of any of th articles contained in the Creed. This was indeed something to b thankful for but it was not enough. Since then two furthe demands have been made with the hope of easing the situation

(1) The first dealt with *the liturgical use* of the creeds. In thi sphere it was desired that the *Quicunque Vult*, asperities of which have been eased by a new English translation, should be placed at the back of the Prayer Book in the company of the XXXIX Articles and should not be authorized for recitation in the publi services of the Church.

This was not granted by our authorities, but a restriction wa made by them in the number of the services at which it wa rubrically directed that the *Quicunque Vult* should be recited However, in the *Shorter Prayer Book*, with a Preface by th present Archbishop of Canterbury, the *Quicunque Vult* wa omitted. As a consequence of these concessions the *Quicunqu Vult* has ceased to be recited in the church services of many parishes.

In the case of the Nicene Creed, owing to the growing separation of Mattins from the Holy Communion, the recitation of the Nicene Creed is now generally restricted to celebrations o the Eucharist.

In the case of the Apostles' Creed, it was urged that it should not be recited at Evensong nor at Mattins unless the congregation requested it, but should be restricted to recitation at Baptism and to instruction in the Church Catechism.

(2) The second remedy demanded was authority to use alternative creeds. In the Modernist Series published in 193 (Skeffington, 3/6) one of the volumes entitled *The Church's Creeds and the Modern Man* was contributed by the writer o this editorial. The volume was dedicated

> *'To all those who are striving to hold the Mystery of the Faith in a pure conscience and desire to affirm that Faith in a true and simple creed.'*

We definitely rejected the policy of emendation and alteration in the case of our historic creeds, but pleaded for freedom to use optional alternative creeds. Such alternative creeds would not necessarily be modern compositions: some of them would consist of Scriptural passages: others would be ancient ecclesiastical creeds (there are some 250 of these in Hahn's *Bibliothek der Symbole*): others could well be in the form of hymns and of course some would be modern prose compositions. When our

hurch authorities can be persuaded to adopt this policy of iternative creeds, many alternative creeds will be forthcoming r them to choose from. We cannot forbear, however, from -publishing here the Creed of a modern churchman in the words an ancient churchman.

We believe :

God is Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.
God is Light, and if we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another.
God is Love, and everyone that loveth is born of God and knoweth God.
Jesus is the Son of God, and God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in His Son.
We are children of God, and He hath given us of His Spirit.
If we confess our sins He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins.
The world passeth away and the lust thereof, but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever. Amen.

IN MEMORIAM

JOHN CHARLTON HARDWICK

1885—1953

We record with a deep sense of loss the death of the Rev. C. Hardwick, Vice-President of the Modern Churchmen's nion and co-Editor of the *Modern Churchman*, who passed vay at Partington Vicarage, on January 27th, 1953. Born 1885 of a Lincolnshire stock, with a churchwardens' ancestry ke Jeremy Taylor, Hardwick was educated at King's School, rantham, where he acquired a competent knowledge of the atin tongue and proceeded in due course to Hatfield Hall, urham University, then under the Mastership of Prof. F. B. vons for whom Hardwick conceived a profound veneration. e graduated with second class honours in Classics.

Hardwick and I met first at Ripon in 1910. Canon J. B. arford, D.D., Principal of Ripon Theological College, directed e as Vice-Principal to interview Hardwick who had applied for mission. I recall the interview vividly. I enquired : 'You are eking ordination?' To which he replied : 'Yes, I have resolved give it a try but I don't know whether I can stick it.' That reply lighted me by its complete sincerity and nothing which curred in the subsequent forty-two years did anything to eaken that first impression.

In 1911 Hardwick entered Ripon Clergy College and wa ordained the same year by Dr. Jayne, Bishop of Chester, an became curate to the Vicar of Dunham Massey, the presen Dean of Canterbury, in whose parish he served for ten years His long curacy under Hewlett Johnson was not only due t mutual regard but also to the fact that in their religion both wer convinced Biblical and doctrinal Liberals. Politically, Hardwic was not a Communist. He stood outside all political parties.

On my first visit to Dunham Massey, after Hardwick becam curate, I called on him and naturally asked him if he found hi environment congenial. He replied: 'Oh, yes.' I then said 'I believe you have a fellow curate.' He replied sententiously, ' have a colleague.' I then said: 'I hope you get on well with him He replied: 'Very well, we are both good trades-unionists.' asked: 'What do you mean by that?' He replied: 'Why, o course, we both combine against the vicar.' This reply was typica of his sardonic humour and contempt of cant.

Another personal characteristic was Hardwick's heroism When a student at Ripon he began to suffer from an obscur spinal complaint which produced increasing lameness and in late years made walking, and finally even standing, impossible. Ho much pain he suffered one could not tell, but the personal incon venience caused by his complaint was terrible, yet he never com plained either by speech, letter or demeanour and continued t discharge his clerical duties until the very end. He owed muc to the devotion of his sister, the unfailing sympathy and con sideration of his diocesan authorities and the kindness of hi parishioners.

He possessed the consolation of wide intellectual interests But these interests were all connected with religion and wer treated in the following series of volumes between the years 192 and 1938.

Religion and Science from Galileo to Bergson, 1920; *Institutiona Religion*, 1929; *Freedom and Authority in Religion*, 1932; *Lawn Sleeve —a short Life of Samuel Wilberforce*, 1933; *The Light that Failed* 1933; *What to Believe*, 1935; *No Casual Creed*, 1937; *While I wa Musing*, 1948.

One volume is omitted from this series as the author himsel omitted it from Crockford. It is *The Professional Christian* — fictitious satire on the rise of a species of clericalism — th outcome of the First World War. Prompted by *saeva indignatio* this book, although true enough in detail, did less than justice t its victims and to the English clergy as a body. Hardwick also published another piece of fiction, a very readable book for boys

Master and Man, describing Wat Tyler's rebellion. It is a pity he did not write more such stories. It brings out his keen appreciation of the beauty of Nature which with literature and religion and human fellowship constituted the four-fold sources of joy in his life.

In 1921, after his ten years as a curate, I invited him to come to Ripon Hall as Chaplain. At that time the Hall was situated across the road from Wadham and he was admitted as a member of that college and graduated as B.Sc. in 1923. After his graduation he was offered the Vicarage of Partington, a rural parish on the banks of the Manchester ship canal and as he found the climate of Oxford trying, especially during long vacation time, he went to Partington and never moved again. He was elect preacher to the University of Cambridge in 1930.

His scientific study of religion was inspired by Prof. F. B. Jevons, whose eminence in Comparative Religion, Classical Culture and Christian Liberalism constituted him for Hardwick 'the Master of them that know.'

Hardwick's researches for his earliest book, *Religion and Science from Galileo to Bergson*, provided him with an excellent *point d'appui* for his future studies and publications in what was now his life-task — the teaching of the true Christian Religion, as he understood it, to his modern-minded fellow human beings. From this time onward he became a regular and valued contributor to the *Modern Churchman*. During his last illness Hardwick was engaged in the preparation of an article for the *Modern Churchman* on Croce's philosophy of the spirit, ethics and politics.

Of his books, the latest, *While I was Musing*, is the best reflection of his personal religion. It consists of some fifty meditations on the Psalms. Of the Hymn Book of the Second Temple, Hardwick writes :

> 'It surprised me to discover that there were more quotations from the Psalter in the *Imitatio* than there are from the Gospels themselves. Certainly the essence of religion lies in them, and though here and there they may contain some too human touches, this is not an unqualified disadvantage if it reminds us that the men who wrote them were not only of like passions with ourselves, but had personal experience of pain, persecution, and sorrow. It is not surprising if there are occasional outbursts of bitterness and despair, as well as passages of sublime faith which have become food for the souls of generations of Christian people . . . the complete sincerity of the Psalms (which makes them great poetry) enables us to find our own experience in them — though, alas, our own fortitude and faith too often fall far short of the grand security which breathes through so many of these anonymous hymns' (p. vi).

Reflecting on Psalm i he writes :

> ' A man who is loyal to his work is nourished by it not only materiall but spiritually — if it is work that is worth doing. It exercises hi physical, mental, and moral powers, which develop by use ; and as lame man is not free to run, a narrow-minded man is not free to thin properly, and a man with narrow sympathies and selfish outlook is nc free to love, which is the greatest freedom of all. The truth is tha just in proportion as a man attaches himself by a bond of loyalty whether it be to work, or wife, or cause, he derives life and powe from that union ; whereas if he ' abideth alone,' like the ungerminatin seed, he will neither grow nor bear fruit ' (p. 10).

Musing on Psalm li he writes :

> ' A saying of the Jewish Fathers has come down to us : " The rewar of precept is precept, and the reward of transgression is transgression. This expresses the truth that patient continuance in well-doing bring to a man a fuller and fuller knowledge of what is right. By pursuin the good we learn to know more and more the nature of the good. B trying to know and do God's will we gain insight into what that wi is, both for ourselves and for the world. " The secret of the Lord is wit them that fear Him " ' (p. 77).

Commenting on Psalm cxxx, ' Out of the deep I have cried unt Thee,' Hardwick writes :

> ' That a man when in the depths should call upon God we all knov to be the wisest course ; yet to do so may not be easy. In such a positio he feels too depressed and discouraged to make an effort, and a sens of defilement may make him hesitate to approach God. It is a long wa up from the depths to those levels where he may walk with God. Ye when a man is down and in despair about himself he does experienc that sense of dependence which for many is the beginning of religion He feels that he *needs* God, and so calls upon Him. Nor is God eve deaf to such a prayer of earnest desire for redemption. Perhaps no until we have been in the depths, and have called out of them to Go for succour, do we really understand the need for God as the saint have felt it ' (p. 131).

Were we required to select Hardwick's epitaph, it would b G. F. Bradby's couplet :

> ' Brave living here : and then beyond the grave
> More life and more adventure for the brave.'

H.D.A.M.

THE CULT OF ÆSCULAPIUS AND THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH*

By John Todd, M.A., F.S.A.

ÆSCULAPIUS, the Greek god of medicine, was not an Olympian. In Homer he was not a god at all but a mortal man, a physician who with his two sons accompanied the army of Agamemnon to the siege of Troy. There is nothing to distinguish him from other Homeric warriors save his skill in medicine and surgery. It is unnecessary to trace the stages of his deification. By the fifth century B.C. he had become a god and was regarded as the son of Apollo and, like his divine father, a potent healer. In art he was represented as a grave, bearded god, something like Zeus, but with a kindlier expression, leaning on a staff round which a serpent twined. The Delphic Oracle proclaims him as son of Apollo and 'born to bestow great joy upon all mortals.' His name is also coupled with that of Apollo in the great Hippocratic Oath from at least the third century B.C.

> 'I swear by Apollo the healer, and Æsculapius . . . that according to my ability and judgement I will keep this oath . . .'

This oath henceforth set the standard for medical practice—Greek, Christian and Islamic.

The chief centre of the cult of Æsculapius was Epidauros near the west shore of the Saronic Gulf. Modern excavations of Epidauros have revealed much of its pristine character — its large theatre, the finest and most complete in Greece, capable of holding at least 10,000 spectators. Near the temple are the remains of a large oblong building where the patients slept in order to receive their healing dreams and visitations. Their experience, known as 'incubation,' is referred to in numerous inscriptions and literary sources. Our earliest literary source occurs in the *Plutus* (408-388 B.C.) of Aristophanes. More than five hundred years later, the orator Aristides, a friend of Marcus Aurelius, for seventeen years journeyed from one Æsculapium to another in search of health. Finally he was cured, and in gratitude to Æsculapius composed *Seven Sacred Orations* in which he describes his experiences at the various shrines of the healing god. The patient visiting the Æsculapium, after ceremonial purification and sacrifice, lay down to sleep in the dormitory ward attached to the temple.

* A rough draft of this article intended for the *Modern Churchman* was found among the papers of the Rev. John Todd after his sudden death.
(Ed., *M.C.*)

The lights were extinguished, and whilst the patients slept th god visited him and healed him. Sometimes, instead of healing the patient at once, the god granted the patient a dream, and nex morning the priests interpreted the dream and revealed to th patient the course of treatment prescribed by the god.

But what about the part played by the serpent of Æsculapiu in the curative process? This is obscure. It would seem that ever Æsculapium was inhabited by the serpent of the healing god, and there is evidence that it was accommodated in a cavern in the floo of the dormitory and it is conjectured that when the lights were extinguished the stone which concealed the cavern was removed and the serpent itself emerged and visited the patients. Thus the serpent came to be identified with Æsculapius himself. This identification would satisfy the statement of pagan apologists tha it was not mere apparitions but the god himself who cured the sick by his presence. We may add that there are still preserved a Epidauros two marble slabs covered with records of cures performed there by Æsculapius, and many other *ex voto* records survive in other shrines of the healing god.

From Epidauros the cult of Æsculapius spread far and wide throughout the Mediterranean world, where Æsculapius had something like three hundred temples, eighty of them in Greece alone. Epidauros remained the headquarters of the cult, and second only to Epidauros was the great Æsculapium of Pergamos (where 'Satan's seat is'; cf. *Rev.* ii, 13).

The island of Cos, birthplace of Hippocrates, the Father of Medicine, had its great Æsculapium, and the remains of the Athenian Æsculapium can be seen to-day under the south side of the Acropolis at Athens. Thus, at least four centuries before the Christian era the cult of Æsculapius was well established.

In 293 B.C., Rome being afflicted by a succession of plagues, a Sybilline oracle revealed that the only effective remedy was to invite Æsculapius to visit Rome. Accordingly, in the form of a serpent, he was brought from Epidauros in a trireme and was rowed up the Tiber. Sighting an island (now known as St. Bartholomew's), he sprang overboard and swam ashore, landing on the spot selected for the erection of his temple. The scene is commemorated in a medal struck by Commodus, whose father, Marcus Aurelius, adopted the title of *medicus* in honour of Æsculapius. On the medal of Commodus the river god of the Tiber is depicted saluting the serpent.

In late Republican times the island, which is about three hundred yards long by about one hundred yards wide, was shaped like a ship and linked to either shore by a bridge. Blocks of travertine

presented the prow and stern, and an obelisk in the shape of a mast was erected in the centre of the island. Plutarch names it the Sacred Island, and its temple and porticoes were devoted to the care of the sick. *Ex-voto* offerings and dedications survive, some of them recording cures in the second century A.D. One *ex-voto* offering apparently refers to a cure of malaria. On its marble is a Greek inscription:

> *'To Æsculapius, the greatest god, the saviour, the benefactor, who by his hand saved me from torpor of the spleen of which this is a silver model.'*

The silver model has long since disappeared. Excavations show that along the approaches to the island were shops for the sale of votive offerings — images, tablets, portraits, models in bronze and terra cotta of parts of the human body. But the most interesting relic of the old Æsculapian days, seen only when the water is low, are the traces of a human figure and, beside it, a staff round which a serpent twines.

When the cult of Æsculapius was at the height of its popularity there existed another healing cult in the Roman Empire — Christianity. Nor is it surprising that the two healing cults, running side by side, came into conflict. That Christianity appeared to the world as a healing cult is abundantly manifested in the writings and practices of the early Christians, and this is shown by the frequent use of medical similes and metaphors in Christian propaganda. Jesus Himself appeared to His followers as a physician and said of his Evangelical Mission: 'They that are whole have no need of a physician, but they that are sick' (*Mk.* ii, 17; *Mt.* ix, 12; *Lk.* v, 31). Jesus, addressing the Nazarenes, said: 'Thou wilt surely say unto me this proverb, Physician heal thyself' (*Lk.* iv, 23). St. Peter, in his address to Cornelius (*Acts* x, 38), describes Jesus as 'healing all that were oppressed of the devil.'

The practice of Jesus in healing the sick became also the practice of the primitive Christian Church. St. James, the Lord's brother, first Bishop of the Church in Jerusalem, in his New Testament Epistle writes:

> **'Is any sick among you? Let him call for the elders of the Church and let them pray over him . . . and the prayer of faith shall heal the sick and if he hath committed sins, they shall be forgiven him'** (*James* v, 14).

St. Ignatius (about A.D. 110) writes:

> **'There is but one physician, Jesus Christ, our Lord'** (*Eph.* vii).

And Tertullian, a century later, describes the water of baptism as '*aqua medicinalis*.' Origen (A.D. 185-253) uses so many medical

similes and terms that it is difficult to select any in particular. Th Nestorian bishop, Aphraates, in the fourth century, calls the Bibl 'the Book of the Wise Physician.' In the *Apostolic Constitution* there is an elaborate comparison of a bishop to a surgeon :

> 'Heal, O bishop, like a compassionate physician, all who have sinne and employ methods that promote saving health. Confine not thyself t cutting or cauterizing or the use of corrosives, but employ bandages an lint, use mild and healing drugs, use words of comfort as a soothing balm.

In the *Clementine Homilies* Jesus is the physician, whilst Simo Magus is the one who brings disease. Eusebius, in his *Demon stratio Evangelica*, writes :

> 'Christ healed and cured the whole human race with the gentl and kind medicines of his words and with the tonic of his teaching. H freed them from all sorts of sicknesses and suffering of body as well as o soul.'

Enough has been said to show that Christianity regarded itsel as a healing cult. As a consequence there was bound to be rivalr between these two healing cults, and for more than three hundred years we can trace in Christian writings, as well as in attacks on Christianity, this antagonistic rivalry. It is clear that by the earl second century the battle between the two rival healing cults wa fairly joined, and this lasted for more than three centuries. Justin Martyr writes about A.D. 150 :

> 'When the devil brings forward Æsculapius as the raiser of the dea and healer of diseases, may I not say that in this matter likewise he ha forestalled our Biblical prophecies?'

It was difficult for the Christians to attack the character o Æsculapius, for no immoral story was associated with him. In the case of Zeus, Hera, Jupiter, Juno and the other pagan deities attack was easy; their quarrels and intrigues, their amours and licentiousness, offered an easy target to the Christians and it was not difficult to pour scorn and ridicule upon them. But no such charge could be brought against Æsculapius, with one exception He was charged with being a lover of money. This charge was made by Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria. The most deadly form of Christian attack against Æsculapius, voiced, for example by Eusebius and Jerome, is that he is 'a destroyer of souls.' Eusebius, in his *Life of Constantine*, commenting on the cures performed by Æsculapius on those sleeping in his temple, concludes by asserting 'although he healed the diseases of those ailing in body, of their souls he was a downright destroyer by drawing them away from their true Physician, Jesus Christ.' Jerome, in his *Life of Hilary*, speaks of Æsculapius as 'the god who does not cure souls but destroys them.'

The strength of the Christian Religion was spiritual and oral: its power to deliver from the slavery of sin and to give piritual life. This was its primary mission, its essential duty. In is moral and spiritual task — 'the calling of sinners to repentnce' — it far surpassed all other religions in the early Roman mpire. It converted those deemed unworthy or those incapable conversion by the religious rivals of Christianity. It cannot be emonstrated that in healing human bodies the followers of Christ ere more successful than those of Æsculapius; but, as Origen ghtly affirms in his *Contra Celsum*, the miraculous healing of ysical diseases is no proof of the truth of the Christian Religion. ven Cicero was disposed to think that obedience to the prescripons given by Hippocrates could be more successful in healing an incubation in the temple of Æsculapius. The spirit of pagan issionary endeavour is unforgettably expressed in the Delphic vitation:

> 'To the pure precincts of Apollo's fountain
> Come pure in heart and touch the lustral wave
> One drop suffices for the guiltless mortal
> All else e'en Ocean's billows cannot lave.'

hat a contrast to St. Paul's description of the membership of the loved churches which he had founded:

> 'Ye see your calling brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called: But God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty; And base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are' (I *Cor.* i, 26-28).

, St. Paul's prophetic foresight was justified as the centuries lled on. The Christian Church brought to nought all its rivals the Roman Empire, including the greatest of them, the cult of sculapius. Before A.D. 1000 the Holy Island of Æsculapius the Tiber was Christianized and a church dedicated to St. artholomew, whose bones reposed in the porphyry sarcophagus nich constitutes its high altar, was erected on the site of the mple of Æsculapius. In the middle of the altar steps is a well, ill in use — the old sacred well of Æsculapius. Here the healg work was carried on under the name of the Christian apostle. ard by the church stands the monastery, which serves as a spital.

But the conversion of Æsculapius did not conclude his perinations. From Rome, the capital of the ancient world, he avelled to London, the capital of the modern world, under his ew designation of St. Bartholomew. It came about as follows.

In the reign of Henry I of England, Rahere, a famous courtier of that sovereign, sometimes described as his jester, converted from the frivolities of the court, went on a pilgrimage to Rome. He there fell grievously ill and in his delirium, faced by the terrors of perdition, he was rescued by a vision of St. Bartholomew. In gratitude he resolved to found a Priory and Hospital, to be dedicated to St. Bartholomew, in Smithfield, London. The foundation of his institution was achieved by incredible exertion and methods[1] in A.D. 1123. Perhaps it is no exaggeration to say, with Henry Morley, that no centre of healing has done more to relieve human suffering than that which we owe to our English Æsculapium in Smithfield.

Can we not imagine Æsculapius, as he reviews his cultus in the light of the advances of modern medicine, uttering the final prayer in the *Religio Medici* of Sir Thomas Browne: 'Dispose of me according to the wisdom of thy pleasure. Thy will be done, though in my own undoing'?

[1] A full account can be found in the *Records of St. Bartholomew's Priory and St. Bartholomew the Great*, by E. A. Webb, F.S.A. (University Press, Oxford; 1921).

THE GNOSTIC ORIGINS OF THE ASSUMPTION LEGEND

By W. H. C. Frend, D.Phil., S.A. Cook Bye Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge

THE comparatively late date at which the cults surrounding the Blessed Virgin became established in orthodox Christian worship invites explanation. In the catacombs it is the person of the Saviour, the scenes of His life on earth as told in the Scriptures, and the prophets who spoke of His coming that inspired the Christian artists of the first three centuries. There are two beautiful examples of the Mother and Child, one in the Catacomb of Priscilla dated to the second half of the third century, and one in the Coemeterium Majus a hundred years later, but these are exceptional.[1] In Rome as elsewhere in the western provinces, representations of the Virgin as the primary figure are rare, especially when compared with such favourite motives as the Good Shepherd, the Three Youths in the Fiery Furnace, and Jonah and the Whale. Of the Assumption itself, only one representation, that on the fourth-century sarcophagus of Engracia from Saragossa, has been published to date.[2] This situation can hardly be due to chance lack of evidence, for in North Africa alone, where hundreds of churches and Christian inscriptions have come to light, invocations to the Virgin, or evidences of ceremonies connected with her name are remarkably few, and nearly all these date to the Byzantine period.[3]

When one turns to the liturgies current in the West the answer is the same. The one account of the Assumption which was well-known, the *De Transitu Mariæ*, was placed by Pope Gelasius in the *De Recipiendis et non Recipiendis Libris* among apocryphal works to be avoided.[4] A century later, the sacramentary of Pope Gregory the Great mentions in general terms the admission of the Virgin into Heaven. But in the seventh century one finds that the feast of the Nativity of the Virgin has entered the Roman

[1] Illustrated in H. Leclercq's article, 'Marie,' in Tome 10.2, cols. 1982—2043 of the *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie chrétienne et de Liturgie*.

[2] *Ibid.* Tome 1, 2, art. 'Assumption,' col. 2989—90. In addition, Mgr. Wilpert has published a fourth-century fresco from Ostia in which the Virgin was represented as an interceder in Heaven. *Römische Quartalschrift*, XIV, 1900, pp. 309—15.

[3] The evidence for the cult of the Virgin in Roman Africa has been collected in R. P. Delattre's *Le Culte de la Sainte Vierge en Afrique après les Monuments archéologiques*, Paris, 1907. Little of significance has been added since that date.

[4] To be found in Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, LIX, col. 162.

liturgy and the bodily Assumption has found its way into the *Missale Gothicum.*

It seems quite clear, as Leclercq has pointed out, that the whole complex of ceremonies centred round the life of the Virgin are Eastern importations.[5] They may perhaps be associated with the resurgence of Greek influences in the West following Justinian's reconquest of Africa, Italy and southern Spain (A.D. 534—560). They can hardly be much earlier, for at the time of the Nestorian controversy Cyril had realized that *theotokos* could not be made into an issue in the West in order to rouse support against Nestorius.[6]

But contemporary with the earliest paintings in the Roman catacombs there is evidence for the growth among the Egyptian Gnostics of a cycle of legends about the Virgin. These are concerned with events in her life which are supposed to have taken place after the Resurrection, and lead up, among other things, to the mystery of her Assumption. These legends can be traced back as far as the mid-second century A.D. In 1896 Carl Schmidt published fragments of the famous Gnostic work, the *Evangelium Mariae*, and he was able to show by a comparison of the texts that this work must have been known to Irenaeus when in about 180 he wrote the *Adversus Haereses.* The *Evangelium* was apparently the work refuted by him in *Adv. Haer.* 1, 29 and 30.[7] In the latter part of the third century the *Pistis Sophia* describes the return of Jesus from His Kingdom of Light to expound to the Virgin, Mary Magdalene and the disciples the great mystery of the conquest of fate and death which He had left unexplained during His earthly ministry.[8] We also hear from Epiphanius in the next century of a Gnostic work called the *Questions of Mary.* It is interesting, too, to find that the Coptic Manichaean psalms current in the fourth and fifth centuries are concerned with the same cycle of legend, and a large number end with the refrain 'Victory to the soul of the blessed Mary.'[10]

[5] H. Leclercq, art. cit. *Dictionnaire,* 10.2, col. 2038.

[6] H. Chadwick, 'Eucharist and Christology in the Nestorian Controversy,' *Journal of Theological Studies,* N.S. ii, part ii, October, 1951, p. 149.

[7] Carl Schmidt, 'Ein vorirenaeisches gnostisches Originalwerk in koptischer Sprache,' *Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akadamie der Wissenschaften,* 1896, pp. 839-847.

[8] *Pistis Sophia,* ed. Carl Schmidt, Leipzig, 1925. Dating, p. lxxxvii.

[9] Epiphanius (ed. Holl), *Panarion,* xxvi, 8, though the Mary of this work may be Mary Magdalene, and so also may be the Mariam of the Gnostic work referred to by Celsus (Origen, *Contra Celsum,* v, 62).

[10] *A Manichaean Psalm-Book,* Vol. II (ed. Allberry, Stuttgart, 1938). I think Mary is too prominent in the psalms to be merely a local martyr.

The *Coptic Acta* which Mr. Patterson quotes in his letter to *The Modern Churchman* seem to belong to this category.[11] Both the Homily of Evodius and the Discourse ascribed to the Monophysite patriarch Theodosius tell the same story, which may reasonably be attributed to a common source. As in the other Gnostic legends the scene is set in the period following the Resurrection. The same characters are gathered together, the Virgin, her companions Salome and Joanna, Mary Magdalene and the Twelve. Jesus appears on the twentieth of the month of Tobi (January 15)—in the *Pistis Sophia* the appearance is on the fifteenth of that month. He warns the disciples that on the morrow he 'must take a great offering' from their midst. Next day He returns on the chariot of the cherubim 'with thousands of angels and David the sweet singer.' St. Peter asks whether Mary might remain with the disciples, but Jesus replies that her time was accomplished. Then Mary dies and Jesus ascends with her soul, which is represented as something tangible and capable of being wrapped up. Seven months later Jesus returns and the Virgin's body is translated into Heaven. Finally, the Virgin reappears with Jesus seated in the chariot of the cherubim and bids the disciples preach the gospel to all the world.[12]

Some of the details of the story invite comparison with the *Pistis Sophia* and also with the Coptic Manichaean texts. The concept of a Kingdom of Light ranged against a Kingdom of Darkness is strongly marked in all these works. Before her Assumption takes place, the Virgin discourses about 'the two powers of light and darkness' and about 'the ruler of darkness.' She asks Jesus to 'save her from the many terrors of the next world — the accusers of Amenti, the dragon of the abyss, the river of fire that proves the righteous from the wicked.'[13] In the second book of *Pistis Sophia* Jesus explains how the believer would be saved from 'the fires of Amenti' and the dragon who ruled over chaos and from the seas of fire.[14] The detail also, in the Assumption legend that 'death dwelt in the south' is interesting, for the south, the direction of the hot, blinding dust storms was believed by both Gnostics and Manichees to be the abode of the Tree of Death which was also the Kingdom of Darkness.[15]

[11] *The Modern Churchman*, Vol. XLII, 4. December, 1952. p. 383.

[12] The quotations are taken from M. R. James' translation, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, O.U.P., 1924, pp. 194 ff.

[13] *Homily of Evodius*, c. 11, James, p. 195. Amenti is the dead Osiris.

[14] *Pistis Sophia*, c. 102, p. 187.

[15] F. C. Burkitt, *The Religion of the Manichees*, Cambridge, 1924, p. 18.

The Assumption of the Virgin does not stand alone among Gnostic legends of resurrections and ascensions. The Sethite library which was buried at Nag Hammadi in Upper Egypt sometime during the fifth century, contained an account of the Ascension of Paul (Ἀναβατικὸν Παύλου)[16], while the Acts of Peter tell the tale of a great competition of magic between St. Peter and Simon Magus in Rome. Finally, when the latter in a supreme effort attempts to fly heavenwards, St. Peter brings him crashing to the ground in the forum at Rome.[17]

Why should these stories have such an attraction to the Gnostics and their Manichaean successors? One of the beliefs which both shared was that the soul was a detached part of the Godhead, consubstantial with Him and emanated by Him. It was 'Light from Light, God from God.'[18] The object, therefore, of earthly life was to discover the means whereby the soul could return to the Kingdom of Light to which it belonged. The means of salvation was Gnosis that would unlock the mysteries of death and fate which determined the hour of death. The ordinary soul, unillumined by divine Gnosis, would wander endlessly through the labyrinth of the circles of the zodiac each ruled over by evilly disposed *archons*. Sin coupled with ignorance would entail the annihilation of the soul. These ideas are to be found in pagan Gnosticism (Hermetism) as well as among the Christian sects.[19] They were not regarded as so much legend, but as literal truths which enabled the believer to resist persecution from 'atheists' and the Hellenised worshippers of idols. Delivery from Death 'with his many terrible faces' was the theme of the Coptic Assumption legend.

We cannot say for certain what were the origins of these beliefs. Why, in particular should the Virgin, Mary Magdalene, Salome and others play such a part in the stories circulating among the peasants of remote corners of the Greco-Roman world? A possible line of inquiry has, however, been indicated by Bousset, and more recently by Bultmann.[20] This is, that deep in the conscience of primitive man in the Mediterranean countries,

[16] Described by H. C. Puech, in 'Les Ecrits gnostiques decouverts en Haute-Egypte,' *Coptic Studies in Honour of Walter Ewing Crum*, Boston, 1950, pp. 91-154.

[17] *Actus Petri cum Simone* (ed. Lipsius, 1891) c. 32, p. 83.

[18] Evodius of Uzalis, *De Fide* 12 (Patrologia Latina, XLII, col. 1143).

[19] See C. H. Dodd, 'The First Epistle of John and the Fourth Gospel,' *Bulletin of John Rylands Library*, XXI, 1937, pp. 129-156, at p. 151.

[20] W. Bousset, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, Leipzig, 1907, ch. iv. R. Bultmann, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, Tübingen, Mohr, 1948, pp. 162-182.

ay the belief that the world and mankind with it had been reated through the sacrifice by the Almighty of some Primal Being to the evil powers that ruled over the depths of chaos. This Primal Being was represented as a first-born of God in either sex. His rescue, entailing the unlocking of the mystery of death and his return to the Kingdom of Light, was the theme of the drama of the world, a drama re-enacted in every individual soul. This concept of the fall and reawakening of the soul through illumination and self-recognition links together the religions of Attis in Asia Minor, of Isis in Egypt, of Hermes Trismegistos and of the Christian Gnostics. In the Coptic *Evangelium Mariae*, the Deity is called 'Protanthropos,' who sends his Son into the the world to overcome death.

To the mass of the native Egyptian believers Christianity did not imply disbelief in the demonic world in which they lived, only the real possibility of its overthrow. But the Christ in whom they believed was less the Jesus of history than a remote World Saviour, impassible, made wholly of divine light substance and whose Resurrection was the resurrection of God Himself. Thus, in the drama of salvation the rôle assigned to the immediate human companions of Our Lord was immeasurably increased. In this saga, the Assumption of the Virgin and the ascent into Heaven of other 'spiritual beings' would be a triumphant climax. It would demonstrate the actual defeat of death by mortals and therefore the eventual salvation of all who accepted the divine Gnosis. The 'heavenly language' in which the Virgin was said to have prayed would be known to all.[21]

If there is any truth in this sketch, the reason why the cult of the Virgin, and in particular of her Assumption, were late in establishing themselves in orthodox worship should be obvious. In the first three centuries A.D., the cult was part and parcel of the Gnostic mysteries, and from them it found its way into Manichaean worship. In Egypt it belonged to the same outlook that produced *Pistis Sophia* or the *Book of Ieou*, and later the Manichaean *Psalms of Jesus*. But in the fifth and sixth centuries these movements appear to have declined, and their ideas were absorbed in part into Coptic monasticism and popular Monophysitism. We have already drawn attention to the similarities between the Gnostic Homily of Evodius and the Monophysite Discourse of Theodosius. One of the reasons for the importance of the fifth-century Manichaean library unearthed at Medinet Madi is that it shows the unbroken continuity of Gnostic ideas

[21] *Homily of Evodius*, c. 10, James, p. 195.

among the Copts from the early to the late Roman periods. It may be that 'the deep religious connexion between the rise in the veneration of Mary and Cyrillism'[22] should be investigated against this heretical background. On the other hand, the western provinces of the Roman Empire in Europe and the barbarian successor states lacked this intensive Gnostic preparation. It needed two more centuries, during which the legendary and the marvellous were to become the commonplaces of religion, before the cults connected with the life of the Virgin fixed themselves in the popular devotion and in the offices of the Church.

THIS TURBULENT PRIEST*

BY the premature death on August 3, 1949, at the age of only sixty-two of Charles Jenkinson, the Church of England lost an unique figure. No other of its clergy was his equal or his like. It is true that the work which brought him not only national but international fame had nothing immediately to do with his clerical calling; but this only adds to the importance and many-sidedness of his character and achievement. For he is widely known, and will be long remembered, as the parish priest of St. John and St. Barnabas, Holbeck, Leeds, who carried through the greatest programme of any British city of slum clearance and demolition, and worked out in detail no less than in general conception the rehousing of the inhabitants in flats and housing estates. This is his ground for fame; and beneath this astounding work many people forget, and few understand, how he came to be a clergyman and to work from the base of one of the worst slum parishes in the United Kingdom. It is the great merit of Mr. Hammerton's little book to relate these two aspects of Jenkinson's work to each other. It should be said at once that Mr. Hammerton has succeeded to a remarkable degree not only in giving a full, detailed, and vivid picture of Jenkinson as a housing reformer, but also in sketching the character of the man, and in uniting both in the priest. When the idea of a short memoir of Jenkinson was first projected, I was very doubtful as to the possibility of its being successfully carried out. Mr. Hammerton has disproved my scepticism, and fulfilled my hopes. Clearly nobody could have written this biography who was not a first-hand spectator of

[22] H. Chadwick, art. cit., p. 162.

* *This Turbulent Priest: Charles Jenkinson.* By H. J. Hammerton. (Lutterworth Press. 1953. 9/6.)

Jenkinson's social work in Leeds; and the achievement of this short volume of less than 200 pages is to have brought out the unity of so diverse a personality. His book is essentially one to be possessed not merely borrowed, and ought to find a place in every public library.

To many of us, as to myself, Jenkinson is still best known as a member of Ripon Hall, one of its most devoted as well as distinguished sons; and as an example of that *avis rarissima* an Anglo-Catholic Modernist, who gave full value and emphasis to both sides of this equation. I first met him at Ripon Hall in 1921; and I had the privilege of keeping up the friendship then formed until his death. Mr. Hammerton brings out a good deal which I had not hitherto known of the early years of Jenkinson's life. He was associated as a layman with Conrad Noel at Thaxted, where he also met his wife. During the first world war he served in the R.A.M.C.; and when the military authorities wished to draft certain Conscientious Objectors from that service into the fighting forces, Jenkinson went directly to Archbishop Davidson and to other bishops in order to prevent the injustice. This was characteristic of the man. He always went to the most influential and powerful person; and he was no respecter of persons. A bishop was as sure to receive a frank opinion from Jenkinson (not always asked for) as a curate. After the War, he read Law at Cambridge as a member of Fitzwilliam House; and then proceeded to Ripon Hall in Oxford. The old Hall, opposite the King's Arms Hotel in Parks Road, bears somewhat the same relation to its present successor on Boars Hill as the post-exilic temple to that of Solomon. But for those who were there in the *annos mirabiles* of the early 1920's, it was a truly remarkable society. It was composed of ex-service men predominantly, nearly all of strong individual character. Amongst them, Jenkinson was in many respects paramount. He always knew what he wanted; and commanded others to assist in getting it done. I remember what we used, humorously as well as satirically, to call 'the Guild of St. Joseph'; namely Jenkinson's organization of a team of men to make with their own hands cycle-racks for the cycles of the Haularians. I was reminded of this both at Barking where he was curate, and at Holbeck, when I saw Jenkinson once more wielding saw and plane. He was also indefatigable as a cyclist; and I remember being towed back from Sutton Courtenay by Jenkinson when my own bike had broken down during an afternoon ride. Nor can I forget the spectacle of Jenkinson setting off for the vacation to Thaxted, carrying an incredible pile of books and a small parcel of personal effects, either on his back or his bike.

But his energies were not exhausted by physical labours. During our membership of the Hall, the Principal was the subject of a charge of heresy, laid against him before Bishop Burge of Oxford. Jenkinson sent, unknown to the Principal, a petition to the Archbishop of Canterbury; and he devoted the whole of a winter vacation to helping the Principal to compile his published defence against the charge. This too was typical of Jenkinson. No labour was too great and no effort too much on behalf of his friends.

Moreover, he was an astonishingly omnivorous reader. In the technical sense of the term he was, of course, no scholar; but his library was surprisingly well-stocked; and he read the books which he bought. In part his wide reading was due to his capacity for rapid scanning of a page and in part to his ability to keep going with very short nights' sleep. I was often amazed to find how up-to-date was his theological reading. Had he been less many-sided he might have made a not inconsiderable student. But his primary interest was in the social relationships of Christianity. I remember being summoned to take Sunday duty at Holbeck for him, before his institution. To be sure, he was already there, but not officially. As we walked round the dismal back-to-back houses and dark streets of his slum parish, he had already made up his mind that the only thing to be done was to pull down all these houses. The story of his unresting campaign for slum-clearance and rehousing is told in detail in this volume. The most remarkable thing about Jenkinson's work in this respect was his combination of broad plans with minute details. I recollect again being taken round his new housing estate and his Quarry Hill flats; and observing the careful attention to detail which he showed, such as, for example, the provision of sitting-baths for old people. It was this capacity for seeing small items as well as large plans which constituted his unique contribution to Leeds housing. Of course both Jenkinson himself and his plans aroused fierce opposition; for he was uncompromising. It should be noted also that his plan for differential rents aroused as much criticism from his own Socialist followers as from his Conservative opponents; for the prosperous worker could not see the justice of paying a higher rent in order to reduce the rent of his unskilled brother! But Jenkinson was indifferent to opposition and criticism; and when he received the reward of losing his place on the City Council, he bore neither grudge nor bitterness; and refused the back-door way of return by means of the Aldermanic Bench. Few social reformers had fewer illusions than Jenkinson about the natural virtues of humanity. He wished to give the people what he thought was for their good; not what they wanted.

Naturally, his absorption in social and civic affairs left him comparatively little time for ecclesiastical matters. Although he most outstanding clergyman of the Church of England, he neither desired nor received any preferment. He played little part in the Modern Churchmen's Union; chiefly because, as he said often to me, it was too Liberal Protestant for his liking, and so little interested in the social problems which were his pressing concern. He was always a Liberal Catholic, and found his natural self-expression in a rich and dignified ceremonial. At the same time his employment of women servers and his advocacy of the admission of women to the priesthood made him an uncomfortable colleague for Anglo-Catholics! He retained a continuing interest and devotion to Ripon Hall; organising a society of Old Riponians, which he insisted must be all-inclusive, whatever the later ecclesiastical or theological developments of its members; and he organised reunions of old members.

It is difficult to be sure what would have been his occupation if his life had been prolonged, for he had resigned his benefice and accepted the chairmanship of the Stevenage Development Corporation. Perhaps, as Mr. Hammerton suggests, he might have settled down to live in this new town in process of erection. But wherever he had settled, he would have remained the same man. His friendship was not a comfortable thing to possess, though a treasured one. He claimed the privilege of the frankest criticism; and made full use of that right. He was brusque and almost intolerant of difference of opinion; but perhaps he was so because conscious of the coming for him of that night when no man can work; and therefore he must make haste whilst it was yet day. For him and for Leeds and for the Church, his day was all too short; and night fell all too quickly. His memorial is written in houses and flats in Leeds: but also on the fleshly tablets of the hearts of his friends.

NORMAN SYKES

PROFESSOR SIMON ON CHRISTIAN ORIGINS*

By S. G. F. Brandon, M.A., D.D.
Professor of Comparative Religion, Manchester University

PROFESSOR M. Simon's contribution to the French series of introductory studies entitled *Que sais-je?* is important on three counts, namely, the reputation of the author, the popularity of the series in which it appears, and its own intrinsic quality. It is necessarily a sketch of the subject with which it is concerned, so that many points of controversy have to be passed over in silence and a minimum of reference given to the relevant literature: nevertheless, it is amazing how much ground is covered in so few pages and how closely some of the basic problems are discussed.

As the title indicates, Professor Simon is concerned with the Christian movement in the formative years immediately following the Crucifixion; the survey closes with the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, which event Professor Simon regards as the most decisive in the life of the Church after the Resurrection experiences — an estimate which is especially gratifying to the present reviewer.

After a masterly sketch of the historical background, Professor Simon enters into his subject with a study of the original community of disciples at Jerusalem: he thinks that the first disciples had gathered there, after the initial Resurrection experiences in Galilee, to await their Master's *Parousia*. The death of Jesus was still a matter of great perplexity to them, particularly his condemnation by the Sanhedrin, and their first attempt at explanation finds expression in the words of Peter: 'And now, brethren, I know that ye acted in ignorance, as did also your rulers' (*Acts*. iii. 17). Professor Simon thinks that it had taken 'the brutal reality of Calvary' to make the first disciples abandon their acceptance of the popular conception of the Messiah and to appreciate their Master's earlier references to the necessity of his suffering. In this connection Professor Simon points out that the mysterious figure of the 'Master of Justice' in the commentary on *Habakkuk* (which was found among the so-called Dead Sea Scrolls), according to the interpretation of M. Dupont-Somer, must now be reckoned with in our estimates of the origin of the idea of the

* *Les Premiers Chrétiens*, by M. Simon. (Presses Universitaires de France. Paris, 1952. pp. 129.)

uffering Messiah. However, even their tardy appreciation of the gnificance of their Master's sufferings wrought no truly funda- ental change in the outlook of these first disciples, for they peared incapable of envisaging their new faith as requiring their paration from Judaism — indeed, as Professor Simon sees it, eir chief peculiarity lay in the fact that they gave a personal me to the anonymous Messiah whose advent was so eagerly aited by their fellow-countrymen.

Professor Simon gives much, and well-merited, space to a scussion of the Stephen episode : the fact in itself is significant, cause it emphasises the growing awareness felt by certain holars that the account of Stephen in *Acts* disguises some crucial isode in the beginnings of Christianity, thereby frustrating our oper understanding of the course of events and exciting in us e suspicion that the author of *Acts* not only knew more than he ose to tell but deliberately re-fashioned what he did record. rofessor Simon concludes that Stephen was not a precursor of aul and his universalism, but a Jew who zealously sought to rify Judaism of what he regarded to be the impious error of the stitution of the Temple and its cultus; Stephen had seen in sus one who could effect this reformation. Hence in the Stephen isode is to be found the record of the temporary crossing of scent Christianity with a Jewish movement aimed at the abolition the Temple-cultus, and so the spiritual heirs of Stephen are to found, not among the champions of the Gentiles, but in those o later produced the pseudo-Clementine writings.

Professor Simon holds that Paul differed from the Jerusalem hristians not only on the question of the applicability of the wish ritual law to Gentile converts, but in the more profound atter of doctrine, particularly that of Christology. He believes at Paul, though by intention loyal to his ancestral faith, was sentially a Jew of the Diaspora, and that, while he consciously tempted no synthesis of Jewish and Greek thought after the anner of Philo, he was subject to '*l'influence de son entourage*.' ccordingly, lacking personal knowledge of the historical Jesus, which the Jerusalem Christians took their stand, and in nsequence little interested in the Master's earthly career and membered teaching, Paul was absorbed in the soteriological gnificance of the Death and Resurrection in a way beyond the e comprehension and the taste of the original disciples. How- er, Paul fought a losing battle with his Jerusalem adversaries : is was due not only to the inherent weakness of his position *s-à-vis* the original disciples and to the free field which was ened to them on his arrest, but also to the essential difficulty of

his own concepts and the more ready appeal of 'the other gospel' it being '*plus accessible aux intelligences moyennes*.'

After describing briefly, but with great insight into the crucial issues, the faith and practice of the Church and its relations with the Roman Government, Professor Simon moves to his conclusion. The arrest and captivity of Paul can be seen in retrospect to have constituted a crisis of peculiar seriousness for the infant Christian faith, because the removal of him who had been inspired to see in Jesus Christ the divine Saviour of mankind meant in effect the triumph of the primitive orthodoxy which was pledged to maintain the abiding essentiality of Judaism. This Gordian knot of racial instinct, which threatened to keep the infant faith fast bound to its ethnic cradle, was severed once and for all by the overthrow of the Jewish national state by the Roman armies in A.D. 70. Professor Simon prefers to accept as authentic the tradition recorded by Eusebius and Epiphanius that the Christian community succeeded in escaping from the doomed Jerusalem and settled in Pella, a Gentile city of Transjordania. However, he is convinced that A.D. 70 marked a decisive turning-point in the evolution of Christianity by ending the control of the Jerusalem Christians and all which that must have meant for the future of the movement initiated by Jesus of Nazareth. A posthumous rehabilitation of Paul resulted, of which the *Corpus Paulinum* is the most notable memorial; but it was only partially accomplished, because the Church, which was thus freed by the events of A.D. 70, remained, however, '*marquée par ses origines*.' Professor Simon sees in the Christianity '*institutionnel et moralisant*' of the second generation the continuing influence of the original Jewish disciples, and in the Gospels, which are concerned to present the '*Jésus de l'histoire*,' he perceives a reaction against the mysticism of Paul and his doctrine of the cosmic Saviour.

Professor Simon's book naturally raises many questions which one has to recognise as being too complicated for discussion within the book's pre-defined limits. However, two of the most pertinent may be briefly mentioned here. The first is that which is raised by the curious conflict of evidence about the attitude of Jesus to the Temple. The accusation that he had threatened to destroy the Temple is imputed to 'false witnesses' in the Markan account of the trial before the Sanhedrin (*Mark* xiv, 58)—an accusation which is repeated by the bystanders on Calvary in *Mark* xv, 29. From this account are we to understand that the charge was a fabrication and that Jesus had never spoken against the Temple? The presumption that this is so would seem to be

rne out by the fact that the Jerusalem Christians continued ithfully in the Temple worship (*e.g. Acts*, ii, 46; iii, 1; xxi, sq.). On the other hand, in the introduction to the so-called ttle Apocalypse (*Mark* xiii, 1-4) it is recorded that Jesus had phesied the destruction of the Temple, although he had not ned himself as the agent of its overthrow. Then there is the port in *Acts* vi, 14, that 'false witnesses' also accused Stephen saying: 'we have heard him say, that this Jesus of Nazareth ll destroy this place, . . .' a charge incidentally with which ephen's subsequent speech appears to be remarkably consistent. e matter cannot be pursued here, but in the light of what ofessor Simon has written about the Stephen episode we may mark that even deeper issues seem to be involved, in that there ms to have been a persistent tradition that Jesus had spoken inst the Temple, which tradition was ascribed by certain ristians to 'false witnesses': but what Christians should have ne this? None appear more likely than the Jerusalem ristians, who were distinguished by their devotion to the mple. But why should they have thus repudiated what seems have been a crucial utterance of their Master? The question rly calls for further investigation. The second problem resides the Jerusalem Christians' conception of the Suffering Messiah. d they merely come to accept the fact that there was scriptural rranty for the sufferings of one who was claimed to be the ssiah, or did they go on to interpret those sufferings as having eriological significance? The point is one of profound impor- ce, and it must be hoped that Professor Simon will be able to cuss it at length in a later work.

A CAMBRIDGE PLATONIST RE-INTERPRETED

By D. L. Scott

THE persistent vitality of Platonic modes of thinking led th Professor of Philosophy in Otago University, New Zealand to carry out a detailed investigation into the writings of Ralp Cudworth, many of which still exist only in manuscript form. Th result of this investigation is succinctly compressed in *Ralp Cudworth — An Interpretation.*[1]

Cudworth's unpublished writings, upon which Prof. Passmor has especially relied, were originally seven in number; but afte a chequered history they at length found their way into the Britis Museum only in fragmentary form — save for a commentary o the Seventy Weeks of Daniel which has survived intact! How ever, Prof. Passmore's interest in Cudworth was not stimulate by such curiosities as this, but by his moral philosophy. Cudworth in this respect, stands somewhat apart from the other members o the Cambridge Platonist group. He differed markedly fro Whichcote, for example, in rejecting the faculty psychology :

> ' Which divided the soul into faculties of Reason, Will and Desire, wit with judgment, volition, and the pursuit of specific ends as their respec tive functions. According to Cudworth, on the contrary, it is " one an the same thing that both judgeth and willeth . . . There cannot be on thing that judgeth, another thing determining the action, for then tha which determineth would not know what it determined " ' (pp. 54-55).

His standpoint thus recalls Matthew Arnold's lines :

> ' Affections, Instincts, Principles, and Powers,
> Impulse and Reason, Freedom and Control —
> So men, unravelling God's harmonious whole,
> Rend in a thousand shreds this life of ours.
> Vain labour ! Deep and broad, where none may see,
> Spring the foundations of that shadowy throne
> Where man's one Nature, queen-like, sits alone,
> Centred in a majestic unity.'

As a moral philosopher, Cudworth's mind was greatl exercised by the problem of free will, upon which he neve reached more than tentative conclusions. In its crude form h dismissed the idea outright, for the very good reason that he coul find no empirical grounds for believing in it. If man was reall endowed with a naked power of choice, then, says Cudworth, ' th

[1] *Ralph Cudworth — an Interpretation,* by J. A. Passmore. (C.U.P. 1951. 15/-.)

kedest person might in a moment by his free will make himself holy as the seraphim.' 'But,' he continues, 'these things are agreeable to the phenomena' (p. 60).

'If,' Prof. Passmore comments, 'morality, as Cudworth maintains, consists in living a certain kind of life, or in coming to be possessed of a certain spirit, then to suppose that man is endowed with a power of choice indifferent in its nature to good and evil does not assist, but actually hinders, the cause of morality' (p. 60)—

oint of view not dissimilar from Dean Rashdall's self determinism, expounded in his *Theory of Good and Evil*.

Perfect freedom, says Cudworth, is 'at once a freedom from law, a state of purest liberty; and yet a law, too, of the most straining necessity' (p. 61). At length he reaches the conclusion that freedom is always the choice of what is good, whilst sin is a failure to exercise that choice.

'Sin is not the wilful opposing of the arbitrary command of another person, but is falling short from natural perfection' (pp. 62-63).

It must not be thought, however, that Prof. Passmore's interest in Cudworth is theological. On the contrary he develops the thesis that there is no necessary connexion between Cudworth's ethics — and those of the Cambridge Platonists generally — and Christian theism at all. His thesis in this respect might be more convincing if his own conception of religion were not so starkly crude, for he seems to regard it as no more than a primitive system of rewards and punishments — of seeking to obtain the joys of heaven and abiding the torments of hell. Christianity and Platonism, he says, 'insort oddly together.' But he is not at all happy in the attempt he makes at a severance, and in the following sentence it is hard to find any meaning whatever:

'It is not too much to say that what particularly attracted (Cudworth) in Christianity was the Platonism in it, but, of course, he did not know that there is Platonism in Christianity' (p. 85).

It was Cudworth's Christianity, too, the Professor continues, which led him to place so much emphasis on praise and blame — in general, on *desert*' — and therefore presumably upon self interest and self seeking. Yet presently he admits (p. 87) 'There can be no doubt, however, that the primary function of God, in Cudworth's theory, is to act as "a fountain of goodness." To put the matter otherwise, God is that which releases us from egoism; and is the source of all disinterestedness. Despite this, we are assured (p. 89) that 'An ethics which is eternal and immutable stands in no need of being supported by God,' but the author does not tell us how it is to stand otherwise.

To those in sympathy with the Cambridge Platonists and th theological stream of which they are a part, this little book wi thus be rather disappointing, though not particularly disturbin The introduction which it gives us to Cudworth's thought welcome, none the less. Whichcote's aphorism, 'Heaven is first temper, then a place' is well known. Less well known Cudworth's observation on hell which Prof. Passmore gives us:

> 'Some think the hellish state is the *sole* product of omnipoten and sovereignty, the effect of God's power. These are injurious appr hensions of God. Here is the truth of the case: *misery doth arise out ourselves;* and misery and iniquity have the same foundation. Hell (f the main of it) is our guiltiness and conscience of it: and the worst God is his just refusal of a sinner' (p. 77).

Tolerant in an age of intolerance, Cudworth and his friend as Prof. Passmore shows, were not merely Vicars of Bray in th support they gave to the Commonwealth first and then in the welcome for the Restoration afterwards. Cudworth

> 'Welcomed Puritanism for its promise of spiritual diversity. But, li Milton, he came to see "New Presbyter is but Old Priest writ large".'

Preaching before the House of Commons in 1647, he expresse the fear

> 'that many of us that pull down idols in the churches may set the up in our hearts.'

'The fluidity characteristic of a revolutionary movement,' observe the Professor, 'soon hardened into othodoxy: new quarre replaced the old ones, new persecutions arose. Not surprisingl (Cudworth) welcomed the Restoration, now the sole hope toleration' (p. 81). This same tolerant spirit led him to declare

> 'I do not doubt that many have over-practised the duty of religio God made religion to be a reasonable service, not a bondage a imposition on human nature.'

And he would have agreed with his friend Whichcote, who, enunciating six mistakes about religion, could affirm:

> 'Better nature alone, though debased, abused, neglected, the ve refuse of God's creation, than that religion which is false and insecu . . . Certainly, were I to take an estimate of Christianity, either fro popery, or any of the gross superstitions of the world, and affect modes of persons, I would return to philosophy again, and let Christiani alone' (p. 82).

This, it appears, is what Prof. Passmore would have us do. B that Christian theism was at bottom no more than an outwo appendage to the Cambridge Platonists' thought, even tho they themselves were wholly unaware of it, we must hold to emphatically *not proven.*

A. K. H. B.

By H. R. Chillingworth, M.A.

THESE letters are not the initials of the name of a new association or of an association so old as to be forgotten. They stand for the names of a Scottish minister whose books, if not best-sellers, were, at any rate, read by thousands of thoughtful persons throughout the English-speaking world in the second half of the last century. The identity of 'A.K.H.B.' became almost as intriguing as the identity of the 'Author of Waverley' had been two generations earlier. The letters were the initials of Andrew Kennedy Hutchison Boyd, a 'country parson' who, however, spent the years of his fame as Minister of Trinity Church, in the little university city of St. Andrews in the Kingdom of Fife. He was born in the Manse at Auchinleck in Ayrshire, in the year 1825, and died at Bournemouth in 1899. He was a typical Victorian, moulded by the *Zeitgeist*, but not enervated by hero-worship. In his writings there is an echo of none of the dominant minds of the period. Neither Carlyle nor Macaulay had him in thrall. His literary style was as much his own as Walter Bagehot's was Walter Bagehot's. Within the range of his thought, wide but superficial, he went his own way, and one feels that, in his case, style revealed the man.

If it did, it revealed a strong masculine mind, not unsympathetic but inclined to be critical of human motives. He had humour in him, the humour of a man confident of success or used to it. I have heard a native of St. Andrews describe him as a rude old man, but I have read nothing of his to induce me to accept *rude* as a justifiable epithet. There is a hint in one of the accounts of his life that he was at times overbearing in conversation, and to the overborne who desired to shine he may have seemed rude. Allowance must be made for a man who was exceptionally rapid in judging the significance of facts and in finding words to express their significance. It must be well-nigh impossible for such men not to be, at times, overbearing.

According to Boyd's own account, his ascendancy began at school. 'He was not a dunce. He was at the head of all his classes.' Nevertheless, he hated work. And, when he was done with school and university, he regarded the writing of books — even his *Recreations of a Country Parson* — as he regarded the writing of sermons, that is, as work. Some thoughtless writer in *The Times* had described the difficulty of writing a sermon, a sermon such as was preached a century ago, as no greater than the difficulty of writing half a dozen letters and crossing them. The young minister, impressed by the leader writer's air of authority,

was at first inclined to accept the dictum, and to approach his sermon writing as 'delicately' as Agag, King of the Amalekites, approached the prophet Samuel. But he took no longer than the King to discover his mistake. Sermon writing was work, and as such was, I suppose, hateful.

His outspokenness on the subject must have endeared him to readers who had grown restive under Carlyle's insistence on work's blessedness. Boyd, I think, overlooked the distinction between work and tasks. There is of course something of pain in all work, but, as Macbeth observed when he offered to guide Macduff to the murdered king's bedroom, 'the labour we delight in physics pain.' I doubt whether Boyd really suffered *much* pain in sermon writing, and I am sure the pain he felt in writing his *Recreations* was negligible. *C'est le premier pas qui coûte.*

The earliest of his published essays seem to have been written when he was minister at Newton-on-Ayr in his native county. In 1854 he became minister at Kirkpatrick-Irongray in Dumfries-shire. Not many miles eastwards was Ecclefechan, Carlyle's birthplace, and Craigenputtock, the birthplace of *Sartor*, was within walking distance. I wonder whether Boyd was interested in *Sartor*. Of course, he could never have written such an autobiography. He had no such story to tell. Whatever spiritual resting-place he reached, it was utterly unlike Carlyle's, and the road to it traversed no such doleful regions as those which Carlyle escaped from in Leith Walk in 1821 when, as he wrote, 'a stream of fire rushed over his whole soul, and he shook base fear away from him for ever.' Boyd's pilgrimage was much less exciting.

His early schooling was got in his home town. In 1839 he was sent with a younger brother to King's College School, London, from which, a few years later, he entered the Middle Temple. In after years he was able to say — perhaps to boast — that he was the only Scottish minister of his time who could claim to have been a Templar. Why he gave up his law studies, I cannot say. *Res angusta domi* may have had something to do with his decision; the cause can have been no trifle, and the decision was probably painful. He became a hard-working pastor, but frequent references in his writings to the law and lawyers seem to indicate a hankering after Themis that died hard. It was well for him that he found in essay writing an outlet for his feelings.

It was well for others, too. His essays in *Fraser's Magazine* were eagerly read and, republished in book form, were sold all over the English-speaking world. It is true that Russell Lowell found in them a 'persistent uniformity of commonplace,' but what he found will evoke no complaints a century hence, when some

erary explorer introduces them to an unprejudiced generation. owell was probably prejudiced; he may have read some un-rtunate remarks made by A.K.H.B. on American intolerance of iticism. British writers of the time, Dickens among them, accus-med to a compact society in which ways of thinking affected the rcumference almost as soon as the centre, could not, or would ot, make allowance for the rawness and inferiority felt by com-unities separated from one another by everything except lan-iage, and in some parts, even by language. In a later essay Boyd pressed regret for his remarks, but injustice is not soon rgotten.

Lowell, I dare say, intended to be severe when he condemned e *Recreations of a Country Parson* for 'uniformity of common-ace,' and by *commonplace* he may have meant something no tter than platitude. A.K.H.B.'s essays are certainly far from ing platitudinous. Platitudes are statements too obviously true be worth making; commonplaces, though generally accepted atements, are big enough in meaning to have more truth for some inds than for others. People 'can talk of things,' said K.H.B., 'know things, and understand things, without *feeling* em in their true importance—without, in other words, *realizing* em.' These are the people who lower the commonplace to plati-de's level. It was inevitable that a writer whose main subject s man in relation to his fellows, should be concerned with mmonplaces, but concern with them no more damned K.H.B.'s performance than it damned Alexander Pope's.

> True wit is Nature to advantage dress'd,
> What oft was thought, but ne'er so well express'd.

he expression of A.K.H.B.'s thought was seldom as happy as ope's, but there was vigour in it which indicated 'a realization its true importance,' transforming for many of his readers mmonplace into originality. A candid friend once told him that s essays were sermons written in polka time, and there was some lth and no unkindness in the description.

Boyd had something of an artist's eye for beauty. One judges at he knew the Alps, and of course he must have seen the rampians many times. But I do not think that mountains attracted m *warmly*; there was in him a strong love of possession and astery, and on the wild mountains he could feel mastery as little a sheep could. He loved to walk or ride about his parish, 'not thout a decided feeling of authority and ownership.' He loved ove most things his garden and tree-surrounded lawn. Moun-ins, at a distance, might be beautiful, but they were valuable

chiefly as walls to protect civilised men from Boreas and his noisy companions.

He had for a short time a cure of souls in Edinburgh, but, as already mentioned, he spent his great years, the last thirty-four of his life, at St. Andrews. There he had among his visitors the men whom he most desired to be friends with. Charles Kingsley was his guest in 1867; James Anthony Froude gave his Rectorial Address (on Calvinism) at the University in 1871, and Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, the famous, the wonderful, Dean of Westminster, preached in the Parish Church (Boyd's church) in 1872. A.K.H.B. loved a lord as dearly as most of us do who have a chance of loving one, but, I think, a dean of the English Church was even more to his taste. And in Stanley he had the greatest, or at any rate, the most talked of deans. A.K.H.B. tells of his preaching in the essay 'Dean Stanley at St. Andrews.' The Dean preached 'exactly as he would have preached in Westminster Abbey.' There was no condescension in his tone or any hint in his words that he regarded himself as a missioner *in partibus infidelium*. Stanley probably knew that, in occupying a Presbyterian pulpit, he was offending high Anglicans, but his Socratic love of forcing people to examine their prejudices (or of setting people by the ears, as his enemies might have said) was too strong to let him leave St. Andrews without accepting the chance given him of preaching in its chief church. Two years later, the students of the University made him their Rector. Stanley gave two addresses, and in A.K.H.B.'s opinion, it was 'simply impossible' that a Rector should have said what he had to say in better fashion. (Did the University's latest Rector, I wonder, model his address on those of his illustrious predecessor?)

If Boyd had not become a popular essayist — probably the most popular *British* essayist of his time — he would have died a disappointed man. He liked popularity — *digito monstrari* — and position, but even the position of Moderator in the National Church would hardly have comforted him when he thought of the career of Archibald Tait, his countryman, who had become Archbishop of Canterbury. Or when he thought of that John Campbell who had turned from the study of Presbyterian theology to journalism and the law, and ended his days as Lord Chancellor. As a notable Scottish churchman and nothing more, it is probable that Boyd would at times have looked sadly at the high road to England, the road which was to lead Maclagan to York and Davidson and Lang to Canterbury.

If a man of talent may be, without absurdity, compared with a genius, one might compare Boyd, in his career and in his attitude

b life and the Universe, with Swift, who regarded himself as anished when appointed to the deanery of St. Patrick's. The mbition of each had been excited in early life by glimpses of areers in England which promised fame and fortune, but both nen were compelled by circumstances to spend their maturity in nvironments which might have induced less vigorous natures to rap up their talents and to sulk. Boyd says somewhere that he had ot left his country once in five years, but he had not much to omplain of : literary friends had come to him from the South, and o doubt his fan mail had brought dozens of letters addressed to ne mysterious A.K.H.B., c/o *Fraser's Magazine*.

As a minister of the Church of Scotland, Boyd was looked on y many of his countrymen as a dangerous innovator, a man who would ruin the simplicity of Presbyterian worship by the introduc- ion of organs (boxes of whistles) and printed prayers. He was no over of extemporized petitions, and he would not have put Jenny Geddes beside (say) Kate Barlas in his gallery of national eroines. In 'Vulgarity in Opinion' he quotes the prayer which roused Jenny's wrath, and adds : 'Jenny, you see, was plainly a opeless blockhead.'

Writing provided Boyd with an outlet for his exuberance. Carlyle is said to have referred to him as 'the taypot : he juist poured and poured.' Carlyle had as little wish to be A.K.H.B.'s passive bucket' as he had had to be Coleridge's a generation or o earlier. Boyd as a talker was too fluent. I notice that, though Kingsley was his guest, the host's name does not occur in the letter which Mrs. Kingsley published describing her husband's tay at St. Andrews. Boyd admired Kingsley, but he was happier with their common friend, J. A. Froude. On one of his incursions nto England, Boyd met Oliver Wendell Holmes. He travelled with him from Carlisle to Birmingham and, we may be sure, not silently; but, in his *Hundred Days in Europe*, Holmes makes no eference to his lively companion. Poor A.K.H.B. ! He *would* have enjoyed reading a few friendly words about himself from the Autocrat.[1]

Boyd in his mental make-up was very much an extrovert, and like many — perhaps most — extroverts, he was a story-teller. He carried on the good work of Dean Ramsay — *good* work, because printed and therefore under control. There was a tartness in most of Boyd's stories which was probably not accidental. His *agape* and St. Paul's had not exactly the same connotation. It

[1] He had them, I am glad to say, in letters from O.W.H. and also from Lowell.

was tempered with much the same qualities as those exhibited by the Scottish minister who, according to A.K.H.B., gave as his text: 'I said in my haste, All men are liars,' and added: 'Ye said that, David, in your haste? 'Deed, if y' had lived in these parts, ye might have said the same at your leisure.'

Many of Boyd's stories, I dare say, have become common property, in Scotland at any rate; but the books containing them are seldom opened. They were products of a theological age which was nearing its end. Boyd had begun to write before Darwin published his *Origin of Species*, and he continued to write almost as if that book had never appeared. The younger generation were reading — or reading about — the new solution of the ancient riddle, and soon grew impatient with writers who accepted the old. Clerical writers other than novelists ceased to attract, and the *Recreations of a Country Parson* had almost as poor a chance of being read as his *Graver Thoughts*. A volume of selections from Boyd's writings was published by Nelson a good many years ago, and this was the only reminder of A.K.H.B. that I could find even in a library that catered chiefly for clerics and divinity students.

[I wish to thank Mrs. H. E. Guinness, of Danesfort, Baily, Co. Dublin; the Rev. N. D. Emerson, B.D., LL.B., Ph.D., of Palmerston House, Broadstone, Dublin; Miss M. Murphy, Baily, Co. Dublin; Miss J. Rodgers, St. Andrews, and Mr. R. G. Cant, M.A., of the Dept. of History, University of St. Andrews, for help of various kinds towards the preparation of this article. —H.R.C.]

THE CHURCH IN THE COUNTRY

A REPLY

By P. Gardner-Smith, B.D., President of Jesus College, Cambridge

PERHAPS one who was born in a country rectory, who spent happy years as a country parson, and who has lived in a village nearly all his life, may be allowed to make a brief reply to the article on the Church in the country published in *The Modern Churchman* for December, 1952.

'A Countryman,' who maintains an understandable anonymity, paints a depressing picture. He arraigns 'enemies without' and 'friends' within. By 'enemies without' he means the rural laity who no longer pay proper respect to their parish clergyman. We are assured that there is a growing weight of public opinion in

ıe countryside that the parson is no longer necessary and should e swept away into the limbo which has already engulfed his ormer ally, the squire. For this the parson is himself responsible, nce he is often of the mass-produced, narrow-minded, but nthusiastic type. In real knowledge or ability he is probably ıdly lacking, but he makes up for that by a commendable display f zeal. Energy, keenness, publicity, and a persuasive tongue are ıe tools of his trade, and his rectory, no longer an oasis of culture ıd gracious living, has become instead a hive of industry. He full of plans and ideas which make little impression on his arishioners, for he no longer commands either their attention or oedience.

These sweeping generalizations make up a comprehensive ough confused indictment. The statement on which they are ounded that there is a growing belief that the parson is unneces- ıry and should be swept away is open to question. There are, ıd always have been, critics of the country parson who deny that e serves any useful function. Critics of the urban clergy are no ss numerous, and so long as there are men who are conscious of o need of religion there will be no lack of persons ready to spense with the services of its teachers. It may be that with the rowth of secularism their number has increased, but when a llage is blessed with a sympathetic and industrious parson his litics seldom form an important section of his parishioners. One ıs only to observe the indignation of a village when it is told at by a union of benefices it is to lose its resident clergyman realize that the parson's presence in a parish is more valued an might at first appear.

When the incumbent does not enjoy the respect and affection his people the man is himself, according to 'A Countryman,' ıtirely to blame. Sometimes that is true. There are parishes in hich the parson, through indolence, lack of tact, or worse ılts, has lost the regard of his parishioners. But apparently ese are not the cases which 'A Countryman' has in mind. His ndemnation is reserved for 'the enthusiastic type,' men who, ough no great scholars and unable on their meagre stipends to ake their rectories oases of gracious living, yet try to do their st by zealous devotion to duty. Among their crimes may be cluded an attempt to run 'an impressive list of organizations,' e visiting of their parishioners, membership of most of the local mmittees, including the Parish and even the Rural District ouncil, where, of course, their 'voice is weak and not heeded as l days gone by.' Worst of all, the zealous parson may direct his ergies into channels beyond the boundaries of his parish and

contribute to the life of his diocese, or even (*horresco referens*) devote his 'long leisure hours to study, devotions, and research.'

What astonishing nonsense this is! One has often heard the clergy criticized for doing too little, but 'A Countryman' blames them for doing too much, and one is left to infer that he prefers the man who pursues neither ideals nor ambitions, the sluggard who has no plans for the betterment of his people and who takes no part in the life of the village. If it be true that 'too many village parsons have forfeited their influence on village life' one knows the type that is responsible.

English life has changed in the last fifty years, and nowhere more than in the villages. The parson's work is far harder now than it was in Victorian times, and every modern development — the motor-omnibus, the cinema, the Sunday cricket match — presents new problems. The changing value of money leaves many incumbents inadequately provided for, even if they eschew 'gracious living' and adopt the most modest standard of life. But if 'A Countryman' does not know parishes in which the parson is still the guide, philosopher, and friend of his people one can only conclude that his experience has been singularly unfortunate. Even poverty commands respect as often as riches, and from the right people. No doubt there are among the clergy men who lack personal force. There are parsons who fail, as they would probably have failed in any walk of life. There are men who find their financial difficulties overwhelming. There are some who have mistaken their vocation. But there are many more who, with little encouragement, strive year after year and by every means in their power to influence for good the lives of their people. Such men seldom lose their reward, even if they are known to employ some of their 'long leisure hours' in prayer and study.

The latter part of 'A Countryman's' article is devoted to an attack upon 'Friends' within, by whom he means the bishops, the diocesan authorities, and members of the Church Assembly. Again he condemns their zeal. He notes that the diocesan authorities have recently made 'frantic efforts' to increase the emoluments of the clergy, but how far he approves is not clear. Since he is unsparing in his condemnation of the means by which these frantic efforts have been crowned with partial success, we must suppose that he would prefer to see the country clergy maintaining their rectories as centres of culture and gracious living on incomes of two or three hundred a year. Really he cannot have it both ways. The poverty of the clergy is 'most to be regretted'; yet if the bishops collect money to improve their position he denounces the 'moral compulsion, which is very great.' In any case, 'A

untryman,' like the traditional Irishman, is heartily and reasonably 'against the government.'

There is no need to pursue his indictment into all its nifications. The Church is undeniably faced with many new bblems in a changing world, and although we may not agree h all the proposals made to meet the new situation, we can rdly blame those who try to adapt an ancient system and make most of the considerable resources of which the Church is still ssessed. At any rate, no young man 'of outstanding vision, aracter, and mental and physical abilities' need fear that he l lack scope for the employment of his gifts in the life of a untry parson.

THE COUNTRYMAN'S LAST WORD

Mr. P. Gardner-Smith is the distinguished Dean of Jesus College, mbridge, and personally I am indebted to him for some valuable advice once gave me, which had a great and lasting effect upon my career. wever, I cannot agree that he is qualified to speak on behalf of the modern ntry incumbent.

He attacks me for criticizing the parson's zeal. That is not true. A eful perusal of my article, I feel, should convince the impartial reader t I am condemning the system, not the man. The wrong kind of clergy-n is getting into the country to-day, who does not understand it, but goes work like the proverbial bull in a china shop. Does Mr. Gardner-Smith y that our theological colleges are turning out 'a mass-produced, row-minded, but enthusiastic type'? That this type is finding its way o our country parishes in ever increasing numbers, where not unnaturally acts as it has been taught to act? And, above all, that the average ntryman, whose tempo is slow and instincts conservative, dislikes these c-dozing methods? He resents — and who can blame him — a parson who ears constitutionally incapable of keeping his nose out of any house or fingers out of any pie; who frequently rides rough-shod over the church ditions of his parishioners, and antagonizes his dissenting brethren. This ctment, of course, could be considerably lengthened. Such 'zeal' is merely futile; it is a danger to the whole parochial system in the ntryside.

Again, I thought I made it quite clear that I had nothing against either studious or the praying parson or even the committee-man, as such. But n, having failed in their parishes, they proceed to do nothing else, it is fferent story!

The argument that because a village resents losing its parson it values , is fallacious. Of course it resents a policy of confiscation however little ay think of the article in question. Nevertheless it is significant that few ishes are prepared to find any money out of their own pockets in order to in 'their guide, philosopher and friend'; and they soon settle down e happily without him. I have yet to hear of any sustained agitation for return!

Finally, for space is limited, Mr. Gardner-Smith makes great play with supposed denunciation of the bishops for raising the stipends of the gy. I am not. What I do condemn are the enormous sums of money ch are yearly sucked into that largely unprofitable maelstrom, the Church

Assembly; or, again, the claims of an unhealthily over-weighted Church Civ Service. It is noteworthy that at least one diocesan budget proposed fo 1953 allocated exactly the same amount of money both for the augmentatio of benefice income and the expenses of the Diocesan Office. It has bee estimated that the Church of England yearly consumes an income of mor than eighteen million pounds: nine million from ancient endowments an the rest 'new money.' With less than 15,000 clergy to provide for, a income of such dimensions should hardly prove inadequate, if rightly an economically administered.

One footnote: Mr. Gardner-Smith observes a discreet silence on m defence of the parson's freehold and lay patronage. Does he approve o 'a pseudo-medieval system in which celibate curates, inhabiting centralize clergy houses, administering wide country areas, and under the direct contr of the official mind, will play a decisive part'? Or the Church Assembl Report on 'The Mobility of the Clergy'?

A Country Parson and Rural Dean
(*alias* 'Countryman')

BOOK REVIEWS

SIX EXISTENTIALISTS*

The six thinkers in question are Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, Jaspers, Marcel Heidegger and Sartre. The purpose of the book, says the preface, i exposition, not criticism nor advocacy. The movement, it adds, 'appears t be reaffirming in a modern idiom the protestant or the stoic form o individualism,' and perhaps it is natural that in days when the individual i being engulfed by the collective, such reaffirmations should be heard. It mus be admitted that the book is tough reading; but it is of value to have al these exponents of the doctrine expounded in a single volume. As one woul expect, they are all highly individual thinkers and not cut to a pattern. O the six named above it would seem that Kierkegaard is having at presen the most marked influence upon popular religious thinkers; and perhap deservedly, for he reflects the current mood of impatience with Romanti idealism. The Romantics claim to reconcile all the contradictions in life an existence. Kierkegaard will have none of this; his watchword was *either—or;* each person must make his own choice between sharply opposed concep tions of life. The individual must enter 'the narrow portal of decision.' Th notion of differences being embraced in 'a higher unity' (Hegel) is a delusio and only an excuse for shying at a decision as a horse does at a fence.

As the author puts it in his final chapter of exposition, this new movemen is really 'a philisophy of personal existence.' It is based on a refusal of an attempt to rationalise existence, which can be experienced in a persona venture even if it cannot be trimmed up by reason. Thus Existentialism ma be regarded as one form of the modern revolt against reason—or agains the view that there are no problems which reason cannot ultimately solve Whether Nietzsche would be content to be classified alongside Kierkegaar and the others may be questioned. He was certainly an individualist, but o a type of which we can easily have too many. For he was the prophet o the hero, the leader, the superman, the Napoleons and would-be Napoleons We have seen enough of these gentlemen. Existentialism may indeed be a sign that 'the springs of philosophical thought have run dry once more.

* *Six Existentialist Thinkers.* By H. J. Blackham. (Routledge & Kegan Paul. 1952. 15/-)

ch a phenomenon occurs every now and again. The characteristic signs the end of an epoch are with us — 'the incorporation of thought in more l more variegated "isms".' Still, if this new philosophical fashion can o the individual to 'keep his end up' in a world which looks upon him ance, it will be useful indeed.

J.C.H.

A MONUMENTAL COMMENTARY

Dr. Vincent Taylor, Principal of Wesley College, Leeds, an outstanding hority on Gospel criticism, has at last published his Commentary on St. rk's Gospel, on which he has been particularly engaged for more than ten rs[1]. Until now his most valuable published work on the Canonical Gospels been primarily concerned with St. Luke (*The Historical Evidence for the gin Birth*, 1920; *Behind the Third Gospel*, 1926; *The First Draft of St. ke's Gospel*, 1927).

His Markan Commentary of nearly 700 pages is the largest of his works published and might almost be described as a Markan Encyclopaedia. Its aracteristics are the breadth of its learning and the judicious character of its nclusions. Dr. Vincent Taylor treads the middle way, but for him the middle y is no narrow way, but extends to the farthest bounds on either side. If, this world, the road that leads to eternal life is narrow, the road that leads scientific truth is very wide.

In the sphere of Marcan criticism Dr. Vincent Taylor is against all final isions of the narrowly exclusive kind. His Marcan Commentary is plainly a book for beginners. The beginner handling it may quickly find himself the Slough of Despond. But after he has passed through the Valley of miliation and climbed the Delectable Mountains he will appreciate the varied spectives revealed by Dr. Vincent Taylor.

Dr. Vincent Taylor's critical position in his Gospel studies is basically that Streeter's four sources, Mark, Q, L, and M. He holds that Mark made use other sources than Peter's reminiscences, to which Papias refers, but ours Rome as the place of the Gospel's origin and its date as somewhere ween 65 and 70 A.D. He is satisfied to identify Mark with 'John whose name was Mark,' the son of Mary, in whose house the Church of Jerusalem assembled when Peter visited it after his deliverance from prison (*Acts* 12:12).

This Mark was the cousin (possibly the nephew) of Barnabas and accom- nied Paul and Barnabas on their First Missionary Journey to Cyprus, where is described as their *huperetes*. Hence Mark knew in the most intimate y the Church of Jerusalem in its earliest days and is referred to by St. er in his Epistle (I *Peter* v:13) as Marcus my son — perhaps because Peter converted him: he knew also the Church of Antioch and its leading mem- s who sent forth Paul and Barnabas on their first missionary journey. He w the Church of Rome when St. Paul was a prisoner there, to judge by the erences to him by St. Paul in *Colossians* iv:10: 'Aristarchus my fellow- soner saluteth you and Mark the cousin of Barnabas' and by the Apostle's mmand in II *Timothy* iv:11: 'Take Mark, and bring him with thee for he useful to me for ministering.' In addition, in an intervening period 'wropt mystery,' Mark visited Alexandria and assisted Barnabas to build the urch there.

In estimating Mark's qualifications for Gospel writing, we venture to nk that not sufficient allowance is made for Mark's key-position and central

[1] *The Gospel according to St. Mark.* By Vincent Taylor, D.D. (Macmillan. 1952. 50/-.)

experience in the Apostolic Church, nor for all that may be covered by the designation *huperetes*, which may well have included the duties of a Christian catechist whom the Apostolic missionaries used as a subordinate evangelist to teach the hard facts about Jesus and His Ministry. It is this catechetical instruction which the *Gospel according to Mark* preserves as a permanent legacy and which was valued so highly by Matthew and Luke that they both used it for their Gospels. Burkett even describes Matthew's Gospel as the revised and enlarged edition of *Mark*. One possessed, as was Mark, of such a wealth of Christian experience must have found it difficult editorially to decide what to exclude from the abundance of his material.

Dr. Vincent Taylor, like Sir John Hawkins (*Horae Synopticae*), holds that our canonical Mark is *Ur-Marcus* and that the problematical section *Mark* vi: 45—viii: 26 included by *Matthew*, except for two incidents but omitted by *Luke* for explicable reasons, is part of the original Marcan Gospel.

In his 'detached note' on *Mk.* x: 45, Dr. Vincent Taylor both in his summary of the conflicting comments of the critics and in his own conclusion is seen at his best as an exegete:

> 'Those who deny the genuineness of the saying too easily assume that its ideas are exclusively Pauline and do not sufficiently recognize that Paulinism is rooted in primitive Christianity. . . . We are ill-advised if we seek to erect a theory upon x: 45 alone, but equally so if we dismiss it as a product of later theological construction' (p. 445).

If Dr. Vincent Taylor's verdict means that 'to give his life a ransom for many' is a *verbatim* utterance of Jesus, we are unable to agree with that verdict and take our stand with Wellhausen and Weiss against it.

This fine Commentary must surely find a place in every modern library in which sound theological learning is treasured.

H.D.A.M.

CONGREGATIONAL CHANTS*

In theory, the composition of good Anglican chants would appear to be comparatively easy. In practice it is very difficult. The entire development must be confined within the limits of one or two musical sentences, and the material must be of such a kind as to permit continuous repetition. These conditions are not easy to fulfil. If the melodic and harmonic material is too distinctive, it will not bear the strain of repetition imposed by even a short psalm. If, on the other hand, the material is lacking in character, repetition will be monotonous. It follows from this that a good chant must form a satisfactory whole, that a sense of melodic climax must be realised within its small compass, and that its harmonic scheme must achieve interest by means of simple components which can be repeated without either monotony or a sense that further development is demanded. As far as melody is concerned, the conditions are fully met by the beautiful melodies of traditional plain-chant, the pliable prose rhythms of which are a model of artistic simplicity, and ideally suited to psalm singing. Inevitably, the fact that Anglican chant is harmonized and in metrical rhythm makes the aesthetic problem much more difficult. It is for this reason that so many of our chants sound stilted and artificial, and will not stand up to the ordeal of repetition. In the absence of a highly trained choir, further difficulties arise and must be borne in mind by the composer. For congregational singing, three conditions must be fulfilled: 1, the

* Review of *The Charminster Chant Book*, compiled by the Revd. Canon D. B. Eperson and others. Price 5/- (1st Edition), 2/6 (2nd Edition), 5 copies for 10/-. Obtainable from Charminster Vicarage, Dorchester, Dorset. (Proceeds for Church School Funds in the Diocese of Salisbury.)

reciting note must not be too high; 2, the melodic intervals must be easy to sing; 3, the melodic compass must not be too wide, preferably within the octave.

Taken as a whole, *The Charminster Chant Book*, compiled by Canon D. B. Eperson, passes these exacting tests with honours, and it can be recommended without reserve to town and country churches, the majority of which lack the services of an expert choir. Some of the chants are the work of well-known church composers, but the majority have been specially written by the compiler and others. All are easy to sing, and most of them are memorable and capable of being repeated without monotony. It is inevitable that some of the chants are less successful than the best. For example, number 9 on page 5 lacks climax and tends to monotony by reason of the fact that the note G occurs four times out of the total of ten notes used. In addition, a number of the chants make use of traditional 'tags' which have already been overworked for generations. But these are minor criticisms. The collection, as a whole, is admirable and can be recommended for use either alone or as a supplement to older collections. The cost of the Second Edition is only 2/6 (5 copies for 10/-), an important consideration for most churches to-day.

Canon Eperson is to be congratulated on his work, which should satisfy a real demand.

NEWELL WALLBANK, Mus.D.

DR. LANGMEAD CASSERLEY'S SEEDS OF THOUGHT*

Prof. Langmead Casserley summarizes the broad argument of his volume *Morals and Man in the Social Sciences* thus in a final chapter and we can do no better than give the author's own words as they appear there.

1. 'We have been led to the conclusion that an altogether absolute ethical theory and too soaring and absolute a humanism are both of them incompatible with the facts which the social sciences have established' (p. 22).

What are these facts?

2. They are facts which suggest

'that there is a real and important measure of truth underlying both relativism and naturalism' (p. 222).

3. The author therefore asserts that

'the specifically Christian type of ethical theory,' which admits of a truth in relativism, . . . 'and the specifically Christian kind of humanism,' which admits of a truth in naturalism, . . . 'are more in line with the attitudes and achievements of the social sciences than the more absolute systems of secular ethical theory and non-religious humanism which so often claim to have supplanted Christianity in the modern world' (pp. 222/3).

4. There is also a fourth conclusion which the author notes as recurring time and time again throughout the book, and it is one which is evident from the three conclusions we have enumerated above. It is that 'a great many of the things which the humanist cherishes, and which he fondly supposes to be innately and characteristically humane, are in fact and essence theological' (p. 223). Here arises an urgency. For we see science turning into technics'; we see our social order 'being transformed into

* *Morals and Man in the Social Sciences.* By J. V. Langmead Casserley. (Longmans, Green & Co. 1951. Price 12/6. 230 pp.)

an administrator's paradise' and no more, and all because the theological foundations of our society and its culture are being ignored.

But the ultimate conclusion is not what the reader might at this point suppose it is going to be, *viz.* that to preserve the social order everyone admires, we ought to become Christians — what the author calls 'a sociological argument for becoming a Christian.' He reminds us that we ought indeed to pay heed to the Christian foundations of a society, but not necessarily to perpetuate it. Rather because any society, either the present one or its successor, if that is different, will have foundations which are of this theological order. The relevance of sociology is that it is one of the means by which this important general point can be established.

To reach these various conclusions the author divides his book into two parts, the first of which is concerned with 'morals in the social sciences'; the second with 'man in the social sciences.'

The broad conclusions of the first part, in which the general characteristics of classical and Christian ethics are examined as well as what is called the 'secularist reaction in modern ethical theory' is that we need to take relativism seriously. We need to reckon with all the facts that have led to recent emphasis on the relativity, the social relativity, of all ethical precepts; and, facing these quite squarely, then to search for some justifiable analysis of the sense in which ethics can still be said to be 'objective.' I am sure the author is right here and makes a point of the first importance. We might have wished that in the sequel he had written more fully and in greater detail, but at any rate his broad contention is clear. It is that, admitting relativism, and even delighting in relativism for the relevance it brings with it, we can save objectivity for ethics by metaphysical presuppositions which are held in faith. 'The only way out of ultimate relativism lies through metaphysics' (p. 114). 'Only if I can discern and reflectively affirm the metaphysical presuppositions of my way of life can I advance beyond . . . subjectivism' (p. 115). We may not be absolutely convinced that the author has in full detail justified this conclusion, but we can be exceedingly grateful to him for making the points he does; for showing us the sort of conclusion he thinks ought to be reached; and for illustrating that conclusion with many examples, and further, a wealth of sociological learning.

In the second part the author's concern is to describe what he considers to be 'the essential humanistic foundations of our civilization' (p. 221). He considers the sense in which modern sociology demands: (1) rationality, (2) freedom, (3) personality. His answers, very briefly, are that it demands *rationality* in so far as the social sciences are looking for some unity by which they can be set together on one language map. The analytical reaction against the great systems of earlier sociologists has led to a great many practically piecemeal investigations, and there arises the need to unite techniques and to create a unitary study of social phenomena from the multitude of those practical insights and concerns which characterize so many contemporary sociologists:

> 'The confusion and incoherence produced by the ambitious, theoretical but embarrassingly diverse constructions of the great pioneers of sociology have provoked a reaction which affects to despise their work and is certainly unwilling to follow their example. As a result many contemporary social scientists are almost entirely taken up with devising new techniques designed to facilitate management and administration in the performance of their functions' (p. 185).

His discussion of *freedom* centres very largely around the discussion of the social sciences in John Stuart Mill's *System of Logic,* Book VI, and

his conclusion is that Mill 'succeeded in establishing very early in the history of the development of modern sociology the feasibility of affirming at the same time both the reality, within its limitations, of man's freedom and the feasibility of a genuine social science' (p. 206). It is true, says the author, that the social scientist can have nothing to do with absolute libertarianism, but neither, he says, can the theologian; for absolute libertarianism is 'a blasphemous identification of man with God' (p. 206). The conclusion is that the social sciences and theology both demand what Casserley calls a 'measure of freedom' (p. 201). I am, however, a little doubtful whether the author has made clear enough the extent of his claim here when he unites sociology and theology in the matter of freedom. In other words, there is what we might call a 'sociological freedom' which is our ability, or lack of ability, to act and to express ourselves in a given society — an ability which no doubt has what the author calls 'the five conditions' ('technical, political, rational, moral and mystical') (p. 193), but this is surely very different from what might be called man's 'metaphysical freedom', which is a concept exceedingly difficult to analyse, which is the concern of theologians and philosophers and of which not the least problem is to relate it to that empirical freedom which is the first brand. When the author tries to do so much as he does, and is primarily concerned with sociology, we cannot grumble that he does not discuss questions as far-reaching as this. But I think we ought to read the book here and at other places with an admiration that is tempered by the realization of how much else remains to be done before the author's main contentions have been thoroughly established.

In some ways, however, he is less unsatisfactory when discussing *personality* in the social sciences, and where again he endeavours to establish common ground between sociology and theology. For here he does begin to deal with some of the theological difficulties centring round the word 'person' and argues that since 'only God is absolutely personal' (p. 216) then man and human relationships are only 'personal' in an analogical sense. Thus the social scientist can have a 'humanistic belief in the personality of man, provided it is stated with the moderation and the qualifications which the theological source of such a belief itself requires and imposes' (p. 221). Yet even here there is an outstanding problem: the sense in which man is 'analogically personal' or God is 'absolutely personal.'

Throughout the book the author makes many important reflections which are a tribute to his powers of insight and analysis. He also makes quite clear the broad conclusions he is seeking to justify. It will be plain, however, that my main criticism is that his argument never goes far enough towards uniting the two. Much more would need saying to demonstrate the full reasonableness of the Christian integration which the author and many others would seek. But let us be properly thankful for what he has done, and not complain because he has not given a superhuman performance. It is a tribute enough to the author that the book is full of interesting points which we long to take further and I will conclude by mentioning only one or two more. There is the remark on worship as a comprehensive power of unity between 'the theologian, the philosopher and the working man' (p. 29); an important point about the limitations of law and the confusions about equality (pp. 38 and 53); a shrewd judgement on political shortsightedness (p. 87) and some fair-minded if provoking remarks on orthodoxy and modernism (p. 152). It is a book which leaves the reader much to think about; and ought we to ask more?

I. T. Ramsey

Oriel College.

COSMIC REDEMPTION*

The ideas and beliefs which form the mental background of the New Testament writings are not widely understood, and the tendency is for them not to be stressed in teaching because in some respects they are alien to our present ways of thought. Our interpreters of these scriptures hope to commend them to us by presenting them as incorporating ideas similar to our own, instead of taking the more difficult and more honest course of helping us to understand a mentality different from that of the modern European.

For example, an obstacle to the proper understanding of St. Paul is the failure to realise the centrality in his doctrine of a belief in some kind of hierarchy of demonic forces. Under a leadership variously described as Sin, Death, or Satan, these powers are in control of 'this age.' Whether written by St. Paul or not, the first two verses of *Ephesians* ii express the Pauline view of 'the human situation.'

> 'And to you did he (Christ) give life, when you were dead through your wrongdoing and sins, in which you were living in the past after the ways of this present world, doing the pleasure of the lord of the power of the air, the spirit who is now working in those who go against the purpose of God.' (Basic English version).[1]

These powers are destroyers of life and the body (I *Cor.* v, 5). They bring temptation (I *Cor.* vii, 5), blind men to the way of their salvation (II *Cor.* iv, 4), while through them not only sin but death also entered into the world (*Rom.* v, 12) and man became 'corruptible' (I *Cor.* xv, 57 ff.).

In all three Synoptic Gospels the ministry of Jesus begins with His complete victory over Satan, the leader of the demonic forces, in the temptation in the wilderness; and from then on begins His ministry of thwarting and defeating these forces. *Mark*, Dr. Galloway holds, 'saw the overcoming of the demonic forces as the central activity of the ministry of Jesus.' From a merely quantitative point of view, the main bulk of this Gospel is devoted to accounts of healing of the sick and the casting out of demons. These healings were signs that the power with which the demons held the whole of nature enthralled had been broken, and the Kingdom of God was at hand.

Thus both in the Synoptists and St. Paul the ministry of Christ is of cosmic significance, since the powers of evil that are being defeated are cosmic powers. Man is being delivered from bondage to the elements of a universe enslaved by sin and death. The redemption of men is immediately associated with the redemption, or restoration, of the whole universe; the power of the 'elements' is overcome. In the well known passage, *Romans* viii, 38 f, the words translated 'things present, things to come, height and depth' are astrological terms,[2] showing that 'no part of the universe is left unaffected by what Christ has done.' The demonic powers in all parts of the universe have been 'put to shame and triumphed over' (*Col.* ii, 15) by Him. Even the *Logos* doctrine (the similarity, or even identity, between it and *Col.* i, 15-19 and *Wisdom* vii, 25-30 is obvious) 'is tantamount to the assertion that in and through Christ the whole universe is reaching its maturity and returning to its perfection.'

Dr. Galloway examines the treatment which this cosmic drama of redemption received in the Patristic period. In his view there was now a noticeable falling away from the spiritual intensity of the New Testament; there was

* *The Cosmic Christ.* By Allan D. Galloway. (Nisbet. 16/-. 1951.)

[1] 'Here,' comments Dr. Galloway, '*kosmos* is equivalent to the whole army of demonic forces in the stars and in the lower air, which distort the goodness of creation, just as we encountered them in I *Enoch*, in *Matthew* xii, 43 and elsewhere.'

[2] Dr. Galloway quotes W. L. Knox as his authority.

ellectual ability, but less religious insight. Nor was the Gentile world quite home with the cosmic symbolism of Jewish apocalyptic. And it was the ilure successfully to reinterpret this symbolism that opened the way for nostic speculation, according to which the cosmos was incapable of redemp-n, while salvation lay in escape from it. Such a view, regarding as it does il as an irreducible element in things, was dualistic and contrary to the ew Testament view that the redemption wrought by Christ included the nole cosmos.

The attempt of the Alexandrian school to translate into philosophic terms e cosmic eschatology of Scripture is regarded by Dr. Galloway as having en a failure. The challenge of the Gnostics demanded some clear statement the place of the physical world in the scheme of things; for if it was ir-ducibly evil there could be no question of any cosmic redemption. Clement d Origen attempted such a statement, but 'were themselves too much der the influence of the Greek depreciation of matter, and thus compromised th the dualism which they were opposing.' Origen's doctrine of redemp-n taking place throughout not merely one world-age, but many, ending a purifying conflagration purging all grossness from matter, and restoring tional creatures to their original heavenly state, resembles a Platonic myth ther than a precise philosophical theory.

> 'What Origen has in fact done, is to take the main outlines of the most widely accepted ideas of the current Stoic eclecticism and to try to interpret Christian doctrine in terms of them.'

On the other hand Irenaeus and the other Fathers of the West did not tempt a solution of the problem, but in fear of where philosophic specula-n might lead them, preserved an attitude of extreme conservatism insist-g on the literal acceptance of the biblical symbols. Thus they destroyed ery chance of the doctrine of cosmic redemption achieving mature expression.

In the event, 'the idea of cosmic redemption never again figured so ominently in Christian theology.' The Middle Ages managed to set the oblem aside. For Aquinas evil is a mere deficiency — the absence of good; such it has only a negative, not a positive, existence. The work of Christ as not a renewing of nature, but a restoring to man of what he had lost at e Fall, namely the gift of Grace. This contrast between nature and grace ature and supernature) is largely typical of the outlook of the mediaeval nurch, and conceals a covert dualism.

> 'The wide acceptance of this world-view kept the problem at bay, and it was only with the dissolution of this covert dualism in the cultural Renaissance and the Protestant Reformation that the modern problem began to take shape.'

Post-Renaissance science, however, produced another dualism, though of different kind. At any moment of consciousness, a person's awareness of s physical environment is made up not only of the simple awareness of nse-data, but also of a vast number of vaguely formulated judgments, scribing to the situation qualities such as beautiful, ugly, noble, horrible, d so on. These latter are necessarily excluded from consideration by the perimental methods of science as being irrelevant. The consequence is at the aspect of experience which lends itself to experimental treatment, vorced from the original unity of experience, expressed itself in a growing sitivism; while the remaining aspects of experience, equally divorced from e original unity, expressed themselves in an unrealistic romanticism. Thus e world of objectively observable phenomena was divested of any signifi-nce it might have in terms of religious or aesthetic values. In Descartes

this bisection of the world of experience into two diverse portions became the basis of a view of things that has lasted until to-day. In the face of this situation, any reference to 'cosmic redemption' becomes a meaningless confusion of two alien languages.

Thus there was emphasised a contrast or contradiction between man's outer material environment and his inner spiritual nature. There appeared a radical incongruity between the determinism of the physical environment on the one hand, and the moral and religious aspirations of personal life on the other.

> 'What had once been conceived as the enmity of the demons in nature to personal life was now recognised simply as the sheer moral indifference of the natural order.'

Dr. Galloway examines the solutions offered by Kant and Hegel. Kant did not abolish the division, but introduced a new dichotomy between phenomenal appearance and 'noumenal' reality. And the phenomenal world was morally indifferent; which means that man, though a moral being, has to cope with an amoral environment. Dr. Galloway draws a parallel between Kant and the Gnostics, who were driven by the moral indifference of man's environment to adopt a dualistic view of the world. And as Origen attempted to correct the Gnostic view, so Hegel strove to break the Kantian *impasse*.

> 'In the whole course of Christian theology there have been only two really great attempts to reconstruct the doctrine of cosmic redemption in terms of a systematic philosophy. Origen's was the first, and Hegel's was the second.'

The trouble is, of course, that in New Testament times the situation was so very different. It was then natural to believe that the world was inhabited by, and directed by, personal or semi-personal beings; a view which no modern European mind can accept. The Pauline and the Synoptic doctrines of cosmic redemption fitted in with this view of things. Can the concepts of that age be related to the concepts of our age? Are there any equivalents?

> 'In the early period the problem was conceived primarily in terms of the demonic possession of nature. In the modern phase the problem is conceived primarily in terms of the relationship of personal beings to an impersonal universe.'

How are these very different concepts related to one another? Dr. Galloway suggests that the enmity of the demonic to spontaneity and vitality (the demons in the New Testament enslave and make sick), which was once expressed in terms of the corruption of nature by the demons, is now expressed in the conception of a mechanistic universe indifferent to the destiny of living spirit. Can this kind of universe be 'overcome and transfigured in the work of Christ?' Such is the modern form taken by the problem of cosmic redemption. Can Christ be 'the revelation and fulfilment of a meaning already latent in the natural order?'

> 'Once we have encountered God in Christ, we must encounter God in all things. This is the sense in which the Kingdom is already come, and the power of the demonic is already broken in Christ, even though the course of cosmic history has not been violated by any cataclysmic intrusion of the Divine. Yet while the course of history remains thus unviolated, its entire face, both before and after Christ, has been altered by His presence and His work in the world.'

Dr. Galloway has provided a most interesting history of the idea of cosmic redemption in Christian thought. One may be permitted to doubt

ether his equation of the demonic with the impersonal, mechanistic aspect things is quite satisfying. For our environment, just because it is 'mechan-ic' and its behaviour predictable, can be controlled by us, to an extent that e demons never were. Also his interpretation of the idea of cosmic redemp-n to-day is in terms of personal religious experience, and so will hardly peal to those — and they are many — who lack that specific experience. t the work is a solid contribution to the history of an idea. J.C.H.

ENGLISH RELIGION 1860—1900

Dr. Elliott-Binns to whom we owe our best *Commentary on Jeremiah* has t given us his Burroughs Memorial Lectures[1] delivered in Leeds University 1950. His intimate association with Jeremiah is reflected in his interpreta-n of this period of our English religious life enshrined in an appropriate al limerick:

There was an old lady of Leeds
Who tried, in their turn, all the creeds.
When disgusted she found
They all left her aground
She attended to other folk's needs

The Burroughs Lectures survey briefly and brilliantly the theological situa-n in England from 1860 to the conclusion of the Victorian era. This com-essed volume constitutes an instructive but of course much less massive quel to Vernon Storr's indispensable treatise—*The Development of English eology in the Nineteenth Century* (1800—1860).

The high water mark of the Liberal Religious Movement in England was ched by the publication of *Essays and Reviews* in 1860 which had been ceded by Buckle's *History of Civilization* in 1858 and by Mill's Essay *On erty,* and Darwin's *Origin of Species* both in 1859.

There is no need to describe the tremendous religious outbursts initiated Darwin's *magnum opus* and *Essays and Reviews* (with its Prefatory Essay Frederick Temple). What however is more surprising is that this religious burst had been preceded a decade earlier by the publication of Alfred nnyson's *In Memoriam* which had proclaimed those profundities of religious ught and faith which should have enabled educated Christian Englishmen, ecially clergymen, to transcend the evolutionary crisis by achieving a higher ritual synthesis.

Dr. Elliott-Binns enables his reader to realize what great Christian teachers later Victorian age possessed. As a Cambridge man he is ever mindful of three great Cambridge theologians Lightfoot, Westcott and Hort. But does not forget Oxford with T. H. Green, Jowett, Gore, Hastings Rashdall Bp. Creighton.

Naturally he deals with *Lux Mundi* with considerable fullness as the Anglo-holic successor to *Essays and Reviews*. Jowett while recognizing its ndly and Christian tones added:

'It is the same old haze and maze—no nearer approach of religion whether to morality or to historical truth'. (p. 65).

It must be recognized however that *Lux Mundi* took over much from the erals. It admitted the claims of Biblical criticism so far as the Old Testa-t was concerned: it also insisted on the claims of practical Christian cialism and last but not least the need for a clearer recognition of the

[1] *The Development of English Theology in the later Nineteenth Century.* Burroughs morial Lectures, 1950, by L. E. Elliott-Binns, D.D., F.R.Hist.Soc. (Longmans, Green Co., 1952; 18/6.)

humanity of Jesus Christ and the limitations it imposed in the spheres of His omnipotence and omniscience.

We are glad to note the author's recognition of Bishop Boyd-Carpenter's great services to later Victorian theology. His Hulsean Lectures, *The Witness of the Heart to Christ,* delivered in 1878, demonstrated the apologetic value of psychology as a factor in the modern presentation of the Christian Religion. Of the Bishop's Bampton Lectures Dr. Elliott-Binns writes:

> 'Attempts to bring home to the general public the true meaning and value of comparative religion were scanty. The matter was complex and not without its dangers to the partially instructed. F. D. Maurice, as early as 1854, had lectured on the subject at King's College, London; but the first real consideration of the study, from a Christian point of view, did not come until 1887 with Boyd Carpenter's Bampton Lectures on *The Permanent Elements in Religion.* The attempt was not without its risks and in some minds at least the suspicion was aroused that the lecturer himself was infected by a kind of lurking infidelity.' (p. 54).

Very properly our volume contains a number of references to Christian dogma. We cite but two:

> 'The refusal to accept dogma was bound sooner or later to rob the Faith of its effectiveness.' (p. 111).

> 'According to the sixth of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England the creeds are based on the Scriptures. If this is so, then the results of Biblical criticism demanded a re-examination of all doctrines to bring them into line with more adequate methods of interpretation; for as F. H. Chase has said "The History of Doctrine cannot rightly be understood apart from the History of Interpretation".'

H.D.A.M.

CHRISTIAN FAITH AND PRACTICE*

Dr. Leonard Hodgson has published the open lectures which he delivered for eleven year as Professor of Moral and Pastoral Theology at Oxford. Their origin is interesting, for it reflects the changing attitude to religion in the University. When Professor Hodgson left Oxford for New York in 1925, after sixteen years as undergraduate and don, the University was still emancipating itself from religious habits and requirements that had characterized it for centuries. Subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles had gone, but compulsory chapels were still common and the examination in scripture, familiarly known as 'Divvers,' was still a necessary prelude to a degree. But there was much restless dissatisfaction with these relics of a by-gone age; their imposition aroused irritation and provoked ridicule.

When Dr. Hodgson returned to Oxford in 1938 the pendulum had begun to swing the other way and, with other senior members of the University, he received a *gravamen* from the Student Christian Movement in Oxford. The burden of the complaint was that the University, still officially a Christian institution (witness the University sermons and degrees conferred in the name of the Trinity), made no provision in its curricula for instruction in the Christian faith except for those specialists reading for the School of Theology. Dr. Hodgson responded to the challenge by delivering each year a course of lectures on Christian Faith and Practice open to all members of the University and included in its official lecture list.

In seven lectures the author gives a synoptic view of Christianity. His purpose is descriptive, not apologetic or hortatory, and though he keeps his

* *Christian Faith and Practice.* By Professor Leonard Hodgson (Blackwell. 1950. 8/6.

bose in mind his lectures are closely reasoned. The result is a persuasive entation of the Christian faith in which the great themes of theology iation, atonement, incarnation, the Holy Spirit, the Church) are expounded rly and concisely. Determined as he is to state the Christian position er than to argue it, Dr. Hodgson succeeds in building up a persuasive for Christian belief and practice. Belief and practice go together, for a d 'is a statement of a view of the universe as a whole put forth by its er as that by which he means to live.' The Christian creed is essentially orical and empirical. In its essence it has always been

a message concerning what God has actually done in the actual history of this world, of that divine action which, even in this world's darkest moments, enables us to believe in the love of God and to have hope in His world.

'If Christianity be not such a message for the world, it is nothing. But it cannot be this without the historical element in its creed, and the price which faith must pay for having anything to say that is worth saying is a willingness to submit its historical assertions to the most rigorous criticism of historical scholarship.'

Dr. Hodgson's claim that the rigorous criticism and historical study of the Old and the New Testaments enables us with greater confidence ever before to proclaim 'our faith in Jesus Christ as God at work in world's history rescuing His world from the chains of evil.' We wonder ther the undergraduates who heard these lectures or the wider circle who have access to them find it as simple and as certain as that. Those whose in traditional orthodoxy has been shaken by historical criticism will not a solution to their difficulties in these lectures. Dr. Hodgson's self-sed limitation, to describe and not to argue, precludes a consideration any of the doubts and questionings that perplex the thoughtful and en-ng Christian.

Within its compass, however, this book will help many to a better under-ding of the Christian faith. The lectures conclude with an appeal to those have followed them to use them as a starting point for further study and iry. As a starting point they are to be commended and they will be ially useful in student study-circles.

W. G. Fallows

MAN, CREATOR OR DESTROYER?

may be true that too many books are being published these days. Or y be that the times are not propitious for the propounding of a 'syn-s' of the sort which George Malcolm Stratton, an American professor of chology, gives us in this book.[1] The title is enough to make us wonder — *Creator or Destroyer* — and from beginning to end we may search for idea worthy of publication and fail to find it. It is not that Professor tton's will is bad or that his writing is unintelligent. Without question eans well, and in the index we find some evidence of wide knowledge. what, in the end, it all adds up to is only yet another plea for 'con-tive' attitudes, 'good' relations on the personal, family, national and national levels, coupled with the usual proviso that this will be a hard and that we must all bend our backs to it. Yes, we may say; yes d. But, then what? And, in spite of a concluding chapter called

[1] *Man, Creator or Destroyer.* By George Malcolm Stratton (George Allen & Unwin Ltd. n. 1952. 16/-.)

'Reclaiming the international mind,' we are left wondering what Profess Stratton really wants us to do and how he proposes that we should do it.

The book, of only 167 pages, is divided into two main parts called respe tively 'Creators' and 'Creators and Destroyers.' Some of the chapter titl will give a clue as to the trend of the thing: 'Man belittled, and his repl 'Creative power itself,' 'Ability turns destructive,' 'The wilds and th reclamation.' The main thesis can be put very briefly: Man, as exemplifi in his personal relationships with other men and in his potentially comma ing power over nature, shows both creative and destructive traits. Occasio ally, as in the 'battle with nature,' destructive powers are harnessed creative ends. On the whole there is no point in over-emphasizing ma destructions. We must all strive to be more creative.

Now all these propositions are, in some form or other, intelligible if n very exciting. In the hands of a brilliant writer something interesting mig conceivably have been made of them. But Professor Stratton, unhappily, not a brilliant writer. His chief methods are those of the *cliché* and the recit tion of important names. And were it not for his professional distinctio we might suppose that a Dictionary of Quotations was his main tool. O brief quotation will indicate the essentials of his style:

> 'Men . . . can stand upright even in the horror and humiliation th persist in bringing on themselves — to which ample heed will be giv later. They cannot agree with those who believe that man is merely animal, or merely a mechanism, or merely an inert particle driven hith and yon by the wind. With difficulty and yet rightly we still may lo out on our kind somewhat as did Miranda in the *Tempest*; or, sober as the Chorus in the *Antigone*, with mounting reason for proclaimi that of all the many wonders of the world, none is so wonderful as ma (p. 31).

We have read this sort of thing before. There is nothing particularly wro with its sentiment, nor is there anything which we want to single out condemnation as dangerously false. Books and ideas are useful or dangero only if they are alive.

It is the very appearance of books of this kind which raises the interesti problems. What is their market? Who buys this kind of book? There is unquestioned need for much hard thinking on the questions we ask abo 'human nature'; and even when most of the popular generalizations end falsifying, we are prepared to hear them out in the hope that something m be added to our knowledge. Our author is a Professor of Psychology, a who of us is unwilling to listen to what a psychologist has to say? But can legitimately request discussions which take us beyond the most trite a (because of their fuzziness) misleading observations. It is of course in c sense heartening to find a writer who is so open in his 'cosmic optimism for, despite the appearances of an analysis of man's destructive acts, Profes Stratton is committed to this position. But these days the evidence is so mu to the contrary that anyone who wants to put the other side has to be ext ordinarily clever and ingenious.

Perhaps calling this book an attempt at synthesis was an inaccura Syntheses, whether lower or higher, must be preceded by the painstaki analysis which shuns the hackneyed, facile comment. If we want to t about Man, Creator or Destroyer we should first be clear about whether makes any sense at all to talk about 'Man' as one or the other or as combination of the two. And it might be that after the analysis we sh find that our terms of reference had become so restricted that the orig 'problem' had evaporated. There are destructive actions and creative on

is, by all means, find out as much as we can about all of them. Hasty, rficial discussions are of little use. This is not to say that Professor ton would be either hasty or superficial when faced with the actual job alysing a specific case. But in this book sensitive and informative analy- far too seldom encountered.

rofessor Stratton has also written other books, including one (in col- ation) on the American nineteenth-century philosopher, Howison. His to this writer is apparent, and not particularly to his advantage.

H. E. Root

gdalen College,
Oxford

CHRISTIAN DOUBT*

his title is a challenge. In Christian ethics faith is one of the three ogical virtues. 'Now abideth faith, hope, love, these three.' Therefore e often assume that doubt must be a vice, since to doubt seems to be pposite of to believe. But they are misled by the ambiguities of language. f can mean the same as faith; it can mean other things too. It can mean ant credulity, it can mean fear to examine and try to understand what ims to believe, and this is scepticism and is not to believe at all. Every e thinker knows that Tennyson speaks the truth: 'There lives more in honest doubt, Believe me, than in half the creeds.'

'Superficially religious people are readily shocked by more deeply eligious people, and this is in large measure due to the greater willing- ess of the latter to doubt' (p. 18).

is necessary to make clear two quite different meanings in the word t. Belief may mean, 'it is certain, it can be proved beyond the possibility ntradiction.' Belief may also mean, 'I am certain, although I cannot proof to demonstration.' Dr. F. R. Tennant proposed to call the first *nty*, the second *certitude*. *Certainty* is intellectual conviction; it is not 'The devils also believe and shudder' (*James* ii, 19). In this kind of there is no room for doubt. But *certitude*, 'I am certain,' is quite ent. Proof is impossible. In place of it there is trust in a person. If the is real, it compels one to action out of the ordinary. It leads one to risks: this is Faith. Jesus asked for faith, when he undertook any lt cure. The hard-pressed father of the epileptic boy begged him to is son. *Mark* ix, 22ff. 'If thou canst, help us,' he said. But Jesus' was daunting. 'If thou canst! All things are possible to him that eth.' To which the father could only answer pathetically, 'Lord I e; help thou my unbelief.'

is is the answer of Faith; for Christian Faith is always accompanied oubt. Unfortunately the ambiguities of language often conceal this. is sometimes thought to be the same as 'the Faith,' a series of propo- s which are repeated as one repeats a theory in Euclid, as if both were y irrelevant to one's own inner convictions and the conduct of life, as h were equally removed from the possibility of doubt. Others are d by such a text as 'Believe on the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved' xvi, 31). Faith seems to them to be something mysterious and super- l, the gift of God, beyond one's understanding, and never to be ned or questioned by the human reason. Because they do not allow faith to be a part of their everyday thinking and living, it remains

hristian Doubt. By Professor Geddes MacGregor (Longmans, Green & Co. 1952. 15/-.)

childish and immature, it may even become quite unreal, nothing more th a form of words.

To-day there is a general confusion of thought. A clamour of ma different creeds assails men's ears, each calling upon mankind to believe and live by it. It is natural that in such a babel Christian teachers shou put forth their chief efforts to establish the things that remain. A phra like Christian doubt is likely to shock them. They do not want to hear Christian doubt but of Christian certainty. That is so natural that it seer unkind to remind them of the evil of healing the hurt of God's people t lightly, of the folly of daubing a wall with untempered mortar. Christi faith needs to be enriched and enlivened and made more genuine. This what Dr. MacGregor sets out to do, showing that both wonder and dou are implicates of faith, and that as faith increases so must they. His boo *Christian Doubt,* will not be welcomed by all; but it should help some go and loyal Christians to become more mature in their loving and thinkin For Dr. Geddes MacGregor, 'doubt, wonder and mystery are not only t beginning of wisdom,' but are also the indispensable concomitants Christian Faith.'

In Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* to which, by the way, no reference made by Dr. Geddes MacGregor, Mr. Greatheart who slew Giant Despair a destroyed Doubting Castle would have been better employed if he had erect a notice at the stile of By-path Meadow: This way to the Celestial City t the pilgrim who would reach it must pay a visit to Doubting Castle kept Giant Despair, since Doubt is for the pilgrim

'the indispensable concommitant of the Faith which carries him beyond

The breadth and variety of Dr. Geddes McGregor's treatment of Christi Faith and Christian Doubt can be in some measure assessed from the tit of his chapters:

> Doubt as an Implicate of Faith: The Sceptical Element in Philosopi and Religious Thought: Convention and Protest in Religion and Irreligion: The Sin against the Holy Ghost: Religious Agnostici and Christian Humility: Psychological Polarity: Faith, Doubt a Laughter: Silence: The Fear of Doubt: The Nature of Christ Doubt: The Disunity of Christendom: Doubt as a Basis for Christ Reconciliation: The Meaning of Christian Mystery: Christian Do and the Mystery of Love.

J. K. NETTLEFOLD

FIVE ANTHOLOGIES

An Anthology is a bunch of flowers picked in the fields of religion, poet philosophy, history or biography. Whether the anthology gives deli depends not only upon the flowers selected but also upon their arrangem and on the qualities of appreciation of those to whom the garland is offer The qualities of appreciation and range of knowledge which have inspi and controlled the selection of the anthology must be matched by sim qualities in him who uses the collection if supreme pleasure is to be reali In short, what we get from the anthology must depend in no small meas upon what we bring to it. Anthologies, and this is their limitation, do themselves supply 'background' and so this has to be supplied by t users. The practical anthology which aims at inspiring and directing ac will demand spiritual and moral usage but not necessarily philosophi historical and literary knowledge.

The five anthologies to which we direct attention in this notice will, efore, not appeal equally to all or be of equal use to all.

(1) *Treasures from the Bible*[1] consists of seventy-four passages from the horised Version of the Old and New Testaments. The passages selected without commentary: only the Scriptural reference is given. 'The plains and pastors of America' are responsible for the collection. The er is based upon popularity, not on date of origin or sequence of ideas. first passage is *John* xiv, the last is I *John* ii.

(2) *Light in Darkness*[2], by Helen Olney, consists of selections for Daily ding intended to inspire the reader with a sense of the Divine Presence guidance. Hackneyed citations are avoided. Many of the selections are n the Bible and these are united by prose and poetical selections which at illuminating and enforcing the Bible citation. The following citation cts the spirit which had inspired this anthology:

'There are two kinds of religious knowledge as of religion itself. The first is the product of tradition, the second is the fruit of experience, one in short is knowledge about God, the other is knowledge of God, and it is this latter kind of knowledge which alone can transform life and character. It is one thing to hold a creed in the sense of accepting the statement of belief which comes ready made, it is quite another to have a creed which is the speaker's own because it has been verified in his personal life, when like St. Paul he is able to say 'I know Him in whom I have believed' (p. 133).—Anon.

(3) *The Fourth Homely Year*[3], by Ida and Leslie Church. This book has en pages of illustrations in photogravure. The citations are biblical, ary and autobiographical. We cite two from well-known Broad rchmen — the Bishop of Birmingham and Robertson of Brighton.

December 9th. 'The Christian religion can be summed up in a sentence: I have found God, and I will try to follow Christ' (p. 133).—E. W. Barnes.

March 9th. 'True rest is not that of torpor, but that of harmony; it is not refusing the struggle, but conquering it (p. 30).—F. W. Robertson.

(4) *One in All*[4], by Edith B. Schnapper, with Introduction by Baron nstierna. This is an anthology composed of affirmations derived from world's great religious teachers. In his Preface, Baron Palmstierna the conclusion of his countryman, Archbishop Nathan Soderblom, con- ed in his Gifford Lectures:

'A measure of revelation, *i.e.* of divine self-communication, is present wherever we find religious sincerity' (p. vii).

Most of us have not the time to read Sir James Frazer's *Golden Bough* he fifty volumes of the *Sacred Books of the East* which we owe to the ition of Max Muller and his assistants we are indebted to Dr. Schnapper her selection from this vast accumulation.

(5) *An Anthology of Prayer*[5], by Claire Kirchberger with an Introduction Godfrey Anstruther, O.P. As an anthology this book is of exceptional

[1] *Treasures from the Bible.* (Allen & Unwin. 1947. 7/6.)
[2] *Light in Darkness.* A book of daily readings compiled by Helen Olney. (Allen & Unwin. 7/6.)
[3] *The Fourth Homely Year.* By Ida and Leslie Church. (The Epworth Press. 1952. 7/6.)
John Murray. 1952. 7/-.
The Harvill Press. 1952. 15/-.)

value. It consists of extracts from unpublished MSS. and printed texts by English writers of the thirteenth century to the fifteenth century, of whom the chief are Richard Rolle, Walter Hilton and Julian of Norwich. The collection is arranged with much insight and exhibits the development of spiritual prayer in various forms and bears witness

> 'to a distinctly English conception and expression of spirituality which is in marked contrast to Post-Reformation Catholic writings' (p. xi).

H.D.A.M.

RUYSBROEK'S MYSTICISM

'Jan Van Ruysbroek,' says Miss Underhill in her Introduction to this volume[1], 'is the greatest of the Flemish Mystics, and must take high rank in any list of Christian contemplatives and saints.' The present book is a reprint of an English version (first published in 1916) of three of Ruysbroek's writings: *The Adornment of the Spiritual Marriage, The Sparkling Stone,* and *The Book of Supreme Truth.*

The background of Ruysbroek's life is far removed from that of our day, and the profound mystical character of his thought may not be fully appreciated by the average 'practical' English reader. The last thirty-eight years of his life (which according to Miss Underhill, was an expectionally long one, 1273-1381 — see pp. xi and xviii) were spent in monastic seclusion, in the forest of Soignes near Brussels. From there his fame (like that of many an Indian jungle-dwelling ascetic) spread far and wide, and numbers came to him for counsel and guidance (pp. xiv-xvi). He was a devout and orthodox Catholic: 'In all things, I submit myself to the judgment of Holy Church' (p. 249). But the inherent kindliness of his heart is often apparent as when, though endorsing the current dogma that all unbaptized persons must go to Hell, he adds: 'Unbelievers, pagans and Jews, shall have *less* pain than the evil Christians, since they received fewer gifts of God' (p. 22).

Present-day readers may be surprised to be told that 'Christ, our Bridegroom, spoke in Latin' (p. 10). But amid some extravagancies of the devout imagination, we find words of shrewd insight and commonsense. For example:

> 'If a man busies himself more with the practice of the sacraments, with their forms and outward symbols, than with the ground and the truth which are signified thereby; so shall he ever remain an outward man' (p. 136).

Nor does Ruysbroek ever forget that even for the most devout *Christian* mystic, there may never be a complete identification of the creature with the Creator, such as is implied in the famous Hindu text, *TAT TVAM ASI*, 'Thou art THAT' (*i.e.*, God Himself). Contrast with this, Ruysbroek:

> 'Though we are one with God, . . . we must ever eternally remain other than God, and distinct from Him. . . . We must abide within ourselves, united with the Fire through inwardness. And we must go forth from ourselves towards all good men with loyalty and brotherly love' (p. 208).

Here we surely find a true echo of St. Paul's 'I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me'; or of St. John's 'Abide in Me, and I in you,' balanced by the no-less-Divine command, 'that he who loveth God must love his brother-man also.'

E. C. DEWICK

[1] *John of Ruysbroek.* An English translation of some of his works. By C. A. Wynschenk Dom. (Second Edition. 1951.)

THE HIERARCHY OF HEAVEN AND EARTH*

'The trouble with religion unmodified by science is that it is incredible; th religion modified by science, that it is not religion. No wonder the pious ow less intelligent and the intelligent less pious, so that both become gments of men. Our many personal and social problems are at bottom smological. We suffer from a disease in our universe; all the rest is signs d symptoms. And the cure is a vision of the living hierarchy.' So the thor remarks on p. 235 and the purpose of the book is no less than an deavour to give us a vision as wide and significant as that.

The book is divided into six parts, and Part I gives us what the author ls (p. 43) 'a rough survey' of an answer to the question with which the ok begins: 'What am I?'

Part II surveys this answer more fully by creating for us a picture of whole hierarchical setting in which our lives are lived.

Parts III and IV expand the picture still further by considerations of ce and time, and in Part V the author returns to an 'autobiographical' w, that is, to a vision of himself as seen from the widest standpoint. In e of the author's own phrases, the whole book indeed is a series of views t' and views 'in,' and in Part VI we get our final view, a view outward. re are some general reflections about the world and about contemporary gious, political and scientific attitudes against the background of the rarchical vision he has given us in the earlier parts. Perhaps I may say eady that the general reader would get the best measure of the book by ning first to Part VI, and only after that beginning to read the book from start.

The author himself calls the book (p. 17) 'unconventional' and conventional it certainly is. It is never a very easy book and sometimes a very clear book, but it has the same strange and somewhat shattering ct on the reader as the writings of the great mystics often have. We all w how very easy it is to dismiss such writings with words like 'rubbish' 'nonsense,' and no doubt some readers will use the same words about Harding's book. But if they do, it will be to their own shame and not for he says much in the book that would be worth their second, their d and probably their further thoughts. Perhaps C. S. Lewis, who tributes an introduction, is making the same point when he speaks of book as giving him a 'bracing and satisfying experience.' Certainly if reader is faithful and perseveres he will at least derive that from the book. rther, I would be inclined (if it is not impertinent) to offer on Mr. Harding's alf a general defence of the strangeness of his writing in many places. at is quite clear about the contemporary situation in science and philo- hy is that older ways of talking have gone for good, and that what is ded is an entirely new outlook on the universe, with which will be ociated entirely new ways of talking about it. There is certainly a g and difficult journey ahead and until it is completed it will be rash to to translate the new view into commonsense terms. The writer will ays face something like Whitehead's difficulty in having to use more or ordinary language in which to express a point of view, for example, ch takes a novel attitude to substance. I am sure it is something like this ch makes Mr. Harding's book as strange and difficult as in places it is. sees the need for a new way of looking at the universe altogether; he s that science and much else demands that; and he endeavours to describe ew of the world in more or less commonsense terms which at the same

* *The Hierarchy of Heaven and Earth.* By D. E. Harding (Faber & Faber. 1952. 21/-. 0p.)

time faces that demand and that challenge. Let us then admire his courage and his vision, and the inspiration he gives us, rather than grumble at the strangeness which must be present in so far as his attempt is successful at all.

Further, as I have said, there are countless places in the book where, even taken out of their context, we find some highly suggestive points. For instance, we may admire the bracing way in which he shows us how very odd is the scientific story which so many of us nowadays accept from the nursery upwards (pp. 28-32); we may admire his remark that the 'distinction is not between the psychical and the physical, between mind and body, but between two aspects of the mind-body complex' (p. 36). We may like his picture of the hierarchy of scientific languages which he compares to an 'ingenious set of telescopic ladders by which he (the scientist) descends deep into the infrahuman realm, while he is himself remodelled at every rung' (p. 43). We may applaud his remark that the 'wall that fences self from not-self is an artificial one' (p. 74); and when we have struggled with many bewildering pages and with countless diagrams, not all of which make the text clearer, we come across passages like the two following, which make all our effort well worth it. On page 118 he remarks that 'science's painstaking ascent of the hierarchy to the solar and galactic planes — each of them taken by itself and in abstraction from what lies below — is our modern version of the *via negativa* of mediaeval mysticism'; or again, let us ponder the wealth of vision and insight in the following passage (pp. 118-119):

> 'It is the mark of man's life at its best that he places it in its full hierarchical setting, so that it becomes an utterly different thing, a sacrament, universal, profound. Christian marriage provides an example. The tale is first of a ceremony before God (and before His angels, according to an earlier version of the Marriage Service), then of registration by the State, then of a family reception, then of a solitary man and woman, then of their organs, then of their cells, chromosomes, genes . . . till we lose track altogether of their joint down-going to the Centre where lovers at last meet and are one. And the second-half of the story is the mirror image of the first, a story of their joint arising in their offspring — a cell, a swiftly evolving animal, a human child, of whom the family and the State and Heaven take cognizance, as he is registered and christened and eventually confirmed. And what is true of marriage is true of all human acts — they are hierarchical and therefore holy, as soon as we see them as they are, vertically instead of horizontally.' A magnificent vision indeed!

Again, we may entirely agree with his remark at the beginning of Part III that:

> 'Science offers me a huge mass of piecemeal information about my nature level by level; but the work of making sense of it by relating the levels has scarcely begun. The laws of hierarchical order, the vertical go of things, the kind of connections between levels that departmentalized science now finds at each level — these are the work of the unitary science of the future' (p. 133).

This indeed is the task for the scientist, the metaphysician and the theologian alike. Even if we think, so much as we understand it, that the unitary schematism that Mr. Harding in detail proposes is more ingenious than convincing, yet again we have to remember the shrewdness of various insights like the following (p. 142): 'Reality in the twentieth century is

versely proportional to hierarchical status. We can believe in electrons that ntrive a God, but not in a God that contrives electrons.'

Again, and from many points of view, I am quite clear with Mr. Harding at all of us need to have new thoughts about space and time. There needs be in this realm of our thinking an entire revolution so that men leave hind once and for all the ideas of an absolute space and a serial time of an ler day which bedevil so many discussions of creation, providence and so rth. All the more reason then why we should try to recapture the sort vision that Mr. Harding gives us on pages 164 and 180:

'The fact is that an event is nothing in itself when it happens, but gains new and fuller meaning as its observers recede from it in time. So long as I have a future my past is mutable; and indeed it needs much longer treatment than it has yet received. Spatio-temporal range determines status. As I walk down from the hills on a clear day the town I see is an hour away; presently I come to where the suburb is fifteen minutes away, then to where this street is five minutes away, this house a minute away, this room a second away, this chair a tenth of a second away — the less I see into my future, the narrower its scope in space. I look forward to some great moments of my life, but as the occasion comes upon me it breaks up into petty details needing instant attention. Only when it is safely past does it regain here and now, by stages, the wholeness which it loses by becoming merely present.'

But there is not only intellectual courage and vision in the book, there is good deal of moral courage as well. Let the reader reflect on his remarks but birth and death on pages 185 and 192:

'To see oneself as an infant is easy; as an embryo, very difficult. It is humiliating enough to have to own to such low beginnings: to trace them still further is to make all our remaining pretensions ridiculous. I am not thinking merely of the comic side of sex. What determines that one's parents shall meet at all? Some petty circumstance — a gust of wind, a banged door, a missed train, a dropped newspaper — a trivial chain of events, and upon each silly link this so important life hangs the whole weight of its being. Here is a microcosm, a universe, fathered by one contemptible accident and dismissed by another. Here is a cosmos poised on a bubble. What could be more absurd?'

en, on death:

'I foresee my fate as man, species, life, earth, and so on; and nowhere is there hope. Not one death awaits me, but many. Yet I live on in this cosmic condemned cell, positively welcoming life on such terms. More than this: it is when I feel most alive and at my best that I endorse my whole future — human, terrestrial, cosmic, with all its deaths. My deepest desire is to live just this kind of life, with its widening circles of death. Once I used to resent being put to bed; now I intend going to bed and to sleep, and the intention is none the less real for the fact that sleep — that first essay in dying — is a necessity of nature.'

we must go further and look at 'the cosmic phase' and then his broad nclusion is on pages 224—225:

'To realize this instantaneous Now, to live in the present moment, taking no thought for tomorrow or yesterday, must be my first concern. And my second must be to find in this Now all my tomorrows and yesterdays. The use of time is to call time's bluff. It is like money — the more

you respect it the less good it does you: you can do nothing without it, and you can do nothing with it except get rid of it. Time arises out of its partial repression. Admit all of it, and it vanishes. The man who would live well this life in time needs to know that it is based upon that lowest hierarchical level which is timeless by the exclusion of time, and upheld by that topmost hierarchical level which is timeless by the inclusion of time.'

In Part VI, as I have already said, the book is much more readable and we might say even topical, for on the matter of angels he has some extremely wise things to say, claiming that an angelic interpretation is a necessary corollary of a hierarchical insight into civilisation. In this part the book even grows political, and the author reflects that (p. 238) 'the story of our civilization is a tale of this descent by three stages, which I shall call the theological, the humanist, and the scientific.' What matters, as he sees it, is what will be our next stage. Is there going to be a bleak annihilation which undertaker's monuments typify, or some vital existence in Heaven? (p. 254).

> 'The brotherhood of man which denies the fatherhood of God, nuclear fission unbalanced by the mystical union, the laboratory which has nothing to do with the church — of these our world is the undertaker's monument.'

In the end there is a plea for 'wholeness,' for a vision and wonder in which a hierarchical survey will culminate.

I will permit myself only one further comment. Even the reader of the review, let alone of the book, might think at times that Mr. Harding is something of a neo-Hegelian by his talk about hierarchies and unities, the whole and so on. Certainly in several places he has to face the traditional problems which have beset Hegelians of many varieties, but it is worth while our noting that, *e.g.* on page 155, he is concerned to maintain the individual: 'hierarchy no more threatens individuals than music threatens notes: it makes them.' And I know of fewer brief discussions of evil which are more suggestive than his remarks on pages 255—256 when after coming so near to an Hegelian viewpoint, he says very much more:

> 'The question is: shall we trust the mood when our hearts are so torn at the sight of the world's suffering that we would see the whole calamitous system unmade, or the mood when we are so in love with God's universe, so thirsty for its life, so enraptured with its improbable beauty, so taken aback with surprise and admiration, that we would not see the particle of a particle altered?'

His answer is that the cure — intellectual and moral — for the world's evil can only come when there is in the individual 'both movements at once.' Then, he says, 'perhaps we shall begin to understand,' but adds, 'yet good and evil must remain to us a terrible and fathomless mystery. The only solution that works is a confession of utter ignorance coupled with an act of utter surrender.'

It is this honesty and humility, this richness of feeling and breadth of vision that make the reading of this book a memorable and significant experience. Let no man be put off by the bewildering strangeness of the earlier chapters or the oddness of much that follows.

I. T. Ramsey

Oriel College.

CELTIC SUNRISE*

Victrix causa deis placuit, sed victa Catoni. To speculate on the *ifs* of tory, like so many things that are unprofitable, is a fascinating occupa- n. People talk, with a certain amount of contempt, of 'the Celtic fringe.' the Celts in their day would seem to have been a gifted and attractive ple — poets and artists, agriculturalists and warriors. And when it em- ced Christianity, the race was richly productive of saints and scholars. e wonders sometimes what would have been the consequences for ropean civilisation had Caesar failed to conquer the Gauls. One wonders , whether the Roman Empire was really the blessing for mankind that its nirers claim that it was. Had there been no Roman Empire, there would e been no Roman Church to extinguish other varieties of Christian piety : that of which the centre was not Rome but Iona, and which looked not Gregory but to Columba for its traditions. And was it really for the best, John Richard Green avers, for the Synod of Whitby (664) to have decreed t the future ecclesiastical allegiance of England should centre on Rome? Miss Leatham in her interesting book does not pronounce on these tters; and indeed there are too few data on which to found a decision. hat she has done is to write, with the enthusiasm of one whose imagina- n has been caught by her theme, of that Far Western Civilisation of the ts, of which Arnold Toynbee speaks, and which might have moulded the ure of Europe on different lines from those it followed. The story is a ange one, and perhaps too little known. When the Roman legions withdrew m Britain early in the fifth century, the Celtic Christians of Ireland, just of reach of the barbarian flood tide that ensued, were cut off and segre- ed for 150 years. Yet far from declining culturally in that isolation, they erwards became a source of light and learning for the rest of Europe. Celtic sionaries and scholars swarmed over Europe and played no inconsiderable t in the Carolingian renaissance. Charlemagne's friend and councillor, uin of York, wrote of the debt owed to 'the very learned Irish masters o enabled the Churches of Christ in Britain, Gaul and Italy to make so at progress.'

In seventh-century England St. Aidan and his fellow Scots from Iona ame the apostles of the Northumbrians. Bede, in his *Ecclesiastical His- y* tells the story. Oswald, educated by the monks of Iona, ruled from his tle at Bamborough, while Aidan, from Lindisfarne, the cradle of Christian- in those regions, evangelised the mainland. But as the Roman legions quered through efficiency and organisation, so by the same means the cessors of Peter on the throne of the Caesars, prevailed. The Far Western ilisation of the Celts became one of the world's lost causes. J.C.H.

CORRESPONDENCE

AS WE ARE IN THE COUNTRY CHURCH

The article by 'A Countryman' reprinted from *The Layman* in your cember issue is timely, and of great interest to me as a country parson.

Nostalgia for times past is very prevalent in country places, particularly ong those who have in their youth experienced the joys of country house — probably the most perfect existence ever devised, and at its very best England before 1914.

My predecessors in this deanery, of only my father's generation, shot, ed, hawked, and hunted, often as acknowledged experts. Their houses

* *Celtic Sunrise.* By Diana Leatham. (Hodder & Stoughton. 1951. 12/6.)

were large, and they added to them, and their cellars were well stocked. They had several servants and a gardener. They enlivened the countrysid by such feats as walking 350 miles to London, or canoeing from one impossibl place to another, building their own aeroplanes and inviting their congre gation to the first flight after evensong, winning eating competitions agains the local champions, and even, it is said of one man, by keeping minnows fo bait in the font.

These were men of some independent means, which their living enhanced who lived a country life by preference, belonged to a privileged class, staye in their parishes for anything up to fifty years, showed no subservience t the squire, and gave the bishop the personal loyalty due to a traditional feuda overlord by the free use of his household, despising sycophancy; and wh dealt fairly, justly and charitably towards their neighbours and poor men Where their means were slenderer, they contrived over the years, to joi themselves so into the working life of the countryside and its sports as t become an integral and greatly missed part of it. In general they wer greatly respected, and in some cases very greatly loved.

It has nothing to do with the Church nor its authorities that in on generation all this has completely changed. It is the result of two world war paid for first by expenditure of accrued capital at home, and then by loss o overseas investments. Any return towards independence for the countr clergy must be preceded either by a national revival in accrued wealth, buil up over generations of peace and security, or by financial expedients withi the Church adequately providing for the clergy. And it is the Church whic must act.

Long consideration leads me to believe that there is only one wa possible—that of amalgamation as united benefices of adjoining countr parishes. This is unpopular with the parishes concerned, and creates muc difficulty for the incumbent, and it should be arranged with a moderation which does not belong to enthusiasts for ecclesiastical planning. The principl to be followed should be that one man cannot, without assistance, adequatel run more than two parish churches (I exclude small mission halls and th like); but that normally, by hard work he is well able, until very old, t manage two. The combination of two such livings provides, in most cases a sufficient stipend; and twentieth century transport has so lessened distance that for priest and people alike it is very widely practicable.

Normally when more than two churches are placed under one rector, curate is needed, if the spiritual life of the parishes is not to suffer greatly Between them they could cover four parish churches; but what is the poin in that? No man-power is saved, the laity are more deeply offended tha is necessary to save the situation, and the number of independent clergy i lessened. There is no excuse for the 'super-rector.' He is a nightmar conception.

B. G. FELL

The Rectory, Askham, Penrith.

[*The Countryman* in its current issue (Spring 1953) relates the followin parish amalgamation, which it claims to be a record:

> 'As some of the neighbouring parishes in the sparsely populated wold could not support their own vicar or occupy all his time, nine were joine with South Ormsby in the largest group yet attempted in any diocese (p. 168).

This parochial group is administered by the rector assisted by two curates —(Ed. *M.C.*).]

A REPLY TO MR. LIONEL CURTIS

I have not read Mr. Curtis' book, *Civitas Dei*, and can, therefore, only discuss the issues raised by him in his letter (*Modern Churchman*, Dec. 1952, p. 81) as they are there presented. These issues appear to be two: (1) Jesus founded not a church but a polity, (2) the polity is to stamp itself on the characters of men. 'The faith we need is the product of institutions based on realities, *i.e.* the laws of God.' The message of Jesus is still a matter of much controversy very largely because we have no direct evidence for what Jesus said since it has been transmitted through men who were convinced that by the death and resurrection of Jesus the new age had arrived. But it seems safe to say that Jesus founded neither a church nor a polity, but in an atmosphere of stress and anxiety proclaimed the coming of the kingdom of God. 'The kingdom of God is at hand' seems to mean: (*a*) that it can be entered now by those who do God's will and, (*b*) that it is soon to be consummated by an act of God himself. This interpretation is of course open to question, but for my own part I do not believe that we can set aside the fact that Jesus proclaimed the end of the age or the world to be imminent. It is, however, often forgotten that to a devout Jew the destruction of the Temple and all it symbolised would have implied the end of all things. That Jesus' conception of the kingdom of God implied certain principles all would accept. But Mr. Curtis seems to imply that abstract principles can of themselves 'stamp themselves on the character of men.' His receipt seems to be that a few men whose characters have been stamped by the principles of the kingdom can construct institutions based upon them which will produce the men we need. But principles are mediated through persons. The principles grounded by Jesus derived their dynamic not from their intrinsic perfection but from his personality. They were one of the means by which that personality was expressed. He impressed himself upon a few souls and so possessed them that nothing could destroy their loyalty to his person which became devotion to the Christ. Thus, I would say, Jesus did not found a Church. But a Church, *i.e.* a group who made him an object of devotion, was the product of his personality. Nor on the other hand did he found a polity in the sense that he left certain principles which prescribed the structure of any political institution. Loyalty to Christ is mystical in its nature and ethical in its outcome. Because it is mystical it needs always to be cultivated by prayer and devotion. What has not yet been freely acknowledged is that it cannot be tied to any particular interpretation of the past. It needs continuously new and true thinking. But to profess loyalty is not necessarily to pursue it. Only where it is pursued can its fruits spring forth whatever the political structure of society may happen to be.

H. C. Snape,

Whalley Vicarage, Lancs. *Member of the Council of the M.C.U.*

DIVORCE OR NULLITY?

While in full accord with the policy of the M.C.U. in the Memoranda presented to the Royal Commission, I would express some doubt as to the wisdom of substituting the term nullity for divorce in all cases in which the termination of a marriage is at issue. According to established use a decree of nullity implies that a marriage has never existed, and therefore no question of termination arises. It is surely necessary, in the interests of the parties, that the distinction between the two entirely different kinds of matrimonial cause should be maintained. In a nullity cause it may happen that no question of moral blame worthiness attaches to either party.

Apart from this, the term nullity has acquired something of a bad odou from its use in cases which are not heard in the courts of justice. Is it wis to extend its use? Some of your readers will remember a notorious case i which a certain peer of the realm was concerned. Shortly after the decre was issued a well-known Roman Catholic layman wrote a letter to th *Times* expressing his deep distress that such a thing could be possible. remember that his letter concluded with the words: 'Many Catholic head are aching, including mine.' A few days later there appeared in the *Time* over his signature, the most complete, abject, and grovelling apology tha could be conceived! What happened between the two letters is not difficul to guess!

HERBERT PEGG

[In view of the strong case stated against Nullity by Mr. Pegg we woul suggest the substitution of Dissolution for Divorce.—(Ed. *M.C.*).]

IN MEMORIAM: H. F. WALKER

Sir,

The death of H. F. Walker of St. Albans and latterly of Arnside i Westmorland, deprives the M.C.U. of one of its most active lay member Educated at Bradford Grammar School he became a solicitor and spent th greater part of his professional career in the Inland Revenue Office a Somerset House. For twenty years he was secretary of the St. Alban Branch of the M.C.U. On his retirement he moved to Arnside in Westmor land where he was the leading spirit in the formation of a North Weste Branch of which he was chairman. He also formed an active branch i Arnside itself. To such devoted laymen the cause of the Modern Churchmen' Union owes much.

H. C. SNAPE

ELECTION TO THE COUNCIL OF THE M.C.U.

Sir,

The Annual Meeting and Service of the Union will be held on May 21st and particulars will be sent to members in due course. Nominations for electio to the Council, with the names of the seconders, should be sent to me to reac me not later than April 13th.

The following retire after serving for three years on the Council, and ar not eligible for re-election, but may be co-opted for a year, viz: Mr. J. F Aitchison, Rev. M. Canby, Rev. J. F. B. Chitty, Rev. H. Taylor, Rev. T. J Wood.

The following retire after serving by co-option, and are eligible for electio or for co-option, viz: Rev. A. W. Adams, Miss A. M. Ashley, Rev. Dr S. G. F. Brandon, Mr. Leslie Brooks, Rev. L. B. Cross, Rev. W. G. Fallows Mr. M. S. Gotch, Rev. J. Pearce Higgins, Rev. Colin King, Lt.-Col. H. H King, Rev. F.W. Moyle, Rev. F. I. L. Rees, Rev. R. C. Unwin, Miss Ire Walker, Mr. P. E. Wallis and Rev. D. E. H. Whiteley.

There are ten vacancies to be filled by election, which is for a period o three years.

T. J. WOOD

Hon. Secretary, Modern Churchmen's Unio

Charlbury Vicarage, Oxford.